



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1999

No. 32

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 2, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CLIFF STEARNS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for 5 minutes.

INTRODUCTION OF GUAM IMMIGRATION BILL AND MAGISTRATE BILL

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation which are important to the people of Guam. Today I am introducing a bill which will significantly impact human rights violations and criminal activity on Guam. During the past year, Guam has experienced a significant influx of Chinese illegal immigrants. Chinese crime syndicates organize boatloads of Chinese to illegally

enter the United States for an exorbitant fee of \$8,000 to \$10,000 per person. After undergoing an arduous journey under fetid, unsanitary conditions, the Chinese reach Guam dehydrated, hungry, disease-ridden and sometimes beaten. Upon arrival, the smuggled Chinese become indentured servants as they attempt to pay their passage to America.

Unlike other streams of illegal immigrants coming into the United States, these immigrants come as a result of a well-organized series of activities organized by crime syndicates. What they do, Mr. Speaker, is they utilize the existing INS regulations, they utilize the INA law in order to apply for political asylum when they arrive on Guam.

Guam's geographical proximity and asylum acceptance regulations make it a prime target for crime syndicates. According to Guam's INS officer in charge, Mr. David Johnston, about 700 illegal Chinese immigrants traveled to Guam last year. Since the beginning of this year alone, 157 have been apprehended by INS, local Guam officials and the U.S. Coast Guard. Since the INS does not have enough funds to detain the Chinese illegal immigrants on Guam, they have proposed to release them to the general populace without assistance. Fortunately, the Government of Guam has offered its already strained resources to detain the illegal aliens until they are ready to be adjudicated.

Mr. Speaker, Chinese crime syndicates have exploited Immigration and Nationality Act asylum regulations for too long. The bill I introduce does three things:

It would prohibit immigrants from applying for political asylum on Guam, an exception from the INA law which is applicable to territories; it would stipulate that the illegal immigrants have to be shipped or deported out of Guam within 30 days; and that the Government of Guam should be compensated

for funds spent on the detention of immigrants pursuant to this act. We must put a stop to this gross offense of human rights and promotion of criminal activities.

Secondarily, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a companion measure introduced in the other body by Senator DANIEL INOUE, S. 184. This legislation permanizes a temporary judgeship in the State of Hawaii and authorizes the addition of another judgeship for the State. It also extends statutory authority for magistrate positions in Guam and the CNMI.

Guam and the CNMI are the only jurisdictions, the only territories, that are not allowed to have additional magistrates, and Guam's district court is ranked number five in terms of its caseload nationwide. We get a lot of cases because of the illegal immigrants, because Guam is a central location. We have opportunities for drug dealers and gun runners to use Guam as a transshipment point. Bankruptcy, tax and civil cases have tripled in 1998.

This is a cost-saving measure. This will allow the Federal judiciary to send an additional magistrate and not send one temporarily, which runs about \$400,000 a year.

UNFAIRNESS IN TAX CODE: MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing a very diverse district, probably the most diverse district in the State of Illinois representing part of the City of Chicago and the south suburbs, Cook and Will counties, and a lot of bedroom and rural and farm communities.

When you represent a district as diverse as the one I have the privilege of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H827

representing, you really have to listen to learn the common concerns of such a diverse constituency. I find a pretty clear message as I listen and learn the concerns of the people of the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs and that is that the folks back home want us to work together, they want us to find solutions, they want us to meet the challenges, they want us to offer and work together to find solutions.

I am pleased that, over the last 4 years, this Congress has responded to that request to get things done. We have got some real accomplishments that we all should be proud of:

Balancing the budget for the first time in 28 years, a balanced budget that is now projected to produce a \$2.7 trillion overpayment of extra tax revenue that is now known as a surplus.

The first middle-class tax cut in 16 years. It is going to benefit 3 million Illinois children who qualify for the \$500 per child tax credit.

The first welfare reform in a generation. That has now seen the results of reducing Illinois welfare rolls by 28 percent.

And IRS reform that tames the tax collector and shifts the burden of proof off the backs of the taxpayer and onto the IRS, so a taxpayer is innocent until proven guilty with the IRS.

Folks back home say, "That's pretty good. What are you going to do next?" When I listen to the folks back home over the last few weeks, they tell me they want good schools, they want lower taxes, they want a secure retirement. And it is our obligation to respond. That is really what our Republican agenda is: to help our schools, to put more dollars into the classroom and ensure that our schools are run by local teachers and local parents and local administrators and locally elected school board members, to lower the tax burden on the middle class and to secure retirement by saving Social Security, providing greater incentives to save for your own retirement.

But we also face what can be considered a great challenge but also an opportunity and that is, what do we do with this so-called surplus, this \$2.7 trillion of extra money that is burning a hole in the pocket of Washington? Somebody wants to do something with it. We know that. But what are we going to do? That is a big debate, what to do with the overpayment of \$2.7 trillion.

The President says we should take 62 percent of that so-called surplus and use it to save Social Security, and then he wants to spend the rest on new government programs. Republicans say, we agree. We will take 62 percent of the surplus for saving Social Security, but we want to give the rest back in paying down the debt and lowering the tax burden on the middle class, because our philosophy is that you can spend your hard-earned dollars better back at home than we can for you here in Washington.

Some say, "Well, gee, why do we really need to lower taxes? You know,

people don't mind paying taxes." Here is why. Today our tax burden is at its highest level ever in peacetime history for our country. Today, for the average family back home in Illinois, 40 percent of their income goes to government at local, State and Federal levels. In fact, 21 percent of our gross domestic product goes to the Federal Government alone. And, since 1992, and I find this very disturbing, the amount of taxes collected from individuals has gone up 63 percent. Clearly, the tax burden is too high, and the middle class is paying the price.

I believe as we focus on ways to lower the tax burden on the middle class that we should start with simplifying our Tax Code, looking for the provisions in our Tax Code that discriminate against the middle class, that discriminate against families. I believe it is time that we eliminate discrimination in the Tax Code and work to simplify the Tax Code.

As we set priorities, let us make the top priority eliminating the discrimination against 21 million married working couples who, on average, pay \$1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married under our Tax Code. Is it not wrong that, under our Tax Code, if you are married and work, you are going to pay higher taxes than an identical couple living together outside of marriage? That is wrong.

\$1,400 back home in Illinois is a year's tuition at Joliet Junior College. It is 3 months of day care at a local day care center. It replaces a washer and a dryer in a home for a middle-class Illinois family.

I am pleased to tell you that 230 Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, have joined together to sponsor the Marriage Tax Elimination Act. This year, as we work to lower the tax burden on middle-class families, let us make elimination of the marriage tax penalty the number-one priority to help families.

Mr. Speaker, we can do it if we work together. The same way that we balanced the budget, the same way that we cut taxes for the middle class, the same way that we reformed welfare, the same way that we tamed the IRS, we can eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight what is arguably the most unfair provision in the U.S. Tax Code: the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank you for your long term interest in bringing parity to the tax burden imposed on working married couples compared to a couple living together outside of marriage.

Many may recall in January, President Clinton gave his State of the Union Address outlining many of the things he wants to do with the budget surplus. Although we were prepared to dedicate 90 percent of the budget surplus to saving Social Security, we agree with the President that at least 62% of the Budget Surplus must be used to save Social Security.

A surplus provided by the bipartisan budget agreement which: cut waste, put America's fiscal house in order, and held Washington's feet to the fire to balance the budget.

While President Clinton paraded a long list of new spending for new big government programs—we believe that a top priority after saving Social Security and paying down the national debt should be returning the budget surplus to America's families as additional middle-class tax relief.

This Congress has given more tax relief to the middle class and working poor than any Congress of the last half century.

I think the issue of the marriage penalty can best be framed by asking these questions: Do Americans feel it's fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel it's fair that the average married working couple pays almost \$1,400 more in taxes than a couple with almost identical income living together outside of marriage? Is it right that our tax code provides an incentive to get divorced?

In fact, today the only form one can file to avoid the marriage tax penalty is paperwork for divorce. And that is just wrong.

Since 1969, our tax laws have punished married couples when both spouses work. For no other reason than the decision to be joined in holy matrimony, more than 21 million couples a year are penalized. They pay more in taxes than they would if they were single. Not only is the marriage penalty unfair, it's wrong that our tax code punishes society's most basic institution. The marriage tax penalty exacts a disproportionate toll on working women and lower income couples with children. In many cases it is a working women's issue.

Let me give you an example of how the marriage tax penalty unfairly affects middle class married working couples.

For example, a machinist, at a Caterpillar manufacturing plant in my home district of Joliet, makes \$31,500 a year in salary. His wife is a tenured elementary school teacher, also bringing home \$31,500 a year in salary. If they would both file their taxes as singles, as individuals, they would pay 15%.

MARRIAGE PENALTY EXAMPLE

	Machinist	School teacher	Couple	H.R. 6
Adjusted gross income	\$31,500	\$31,500	\$63,000	\$63,000
Less personal exemption and standard deduction	6,950	6,950	12,500	13,900 (singles 2)
Taxable income	24,550 (.15)	24,550 (.15)	50,500 (partial .28)	49,100 (.15)
Tax liability	3,682.5	3,682.5	8,635	7,365

Marriage penalty: \$1,270.
Relief: \$1,270.

But if they chose to live their lives in holy matrimony, and now file jointly, their combined income of \$61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28 percent, producing a tax penalty of \$1,400 in higher taxes.

On average, America's married working couples pay \$1,400 more a year in taxes than individuals with the same incomes. That's serious money. Millions of married couples are still stinging from April 15th's tax bite and more married couples are realizing that they are suffering the marriage tax penalty.

Particularly if you think of it in terms of: a downpayment on a house or a car, one year's tuition at a local community college, or several months worth of quality child care at a local day care center.

To that end, U.S. Representative DAVID MCINTOSH (R-IN) and U.S. Representative

PAT DANNER (D-MO) and I have authored H.R. 6, The Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

H.R. 6, The Marriage Tax Elimination Act, will increase the tax brackets (currently at 15% for the first \$24,650 for singles, whereas married couples filing jointly pay 15% on the first \$41,200 of their taxable income) to twice that enjoyed by singles; H.R. 6 would extend a married couple's 15% tax bracket to \$49,300. Thus, married couples would enjoy an additional \$8,100 in taxable income subject to the low 15% tax rate as opposed to the current 28% tax rate and would result in up to \$1,215 in tax relief.

Additionally the bill will increase the standard deduction for married couples (currently \$6,900) to twice that of singles (currently at \$4,150). Under H.R. 6 the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly would be increased to \$8,300.

H.R. 6 enjoys the bipartisan support of 230 co-sponsors along with family groups, including: American Association of Christian Schools, American Family Association, Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, Family Research Council, Home School Legal Defense Association, the National Association of Evangelicals and the Traditional Values Coalition.

It isn't enough for President Clinton to suggest tax breaks for child care. The President's child care proposal would help a working couple afford, on average, three weeks of day care. Elimination of the marriage tax penalty would give the same couple the choice of paying for three months of child care—or addressing other family priorities. After all, parents know better than Washington what their family needs.

We fondly remember the 1996 State of the Union address when the President declared emphatically that, quote "the era of big government is over."

We must stick to our guns, and stay the course.

There never was an American appetite for big government.

But there certainly is for reforming the existing way government does business.

And what better way to show the American people that our government will continue along the path to reform and prosperity than by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are on the verge of running a surplus. It's basic math.

It means Americans are already paying more than is needed for government to do the job we expect of it.

What better way to give back than to begin with mom and dad and the American family—the backbone of our society.

We ask that President Clinton join with Congress and make elimination of the marriage tax penalty . . . a bipartisan priority.

Of all the challenges married couples face in providing home and hearth to America's children, the U.S. tax code should not be one of them.

Let's eliminate the marriage tax penalty and do it now!

[From the Chicago Tribune, January 31, 1999]

HOW TO HANDLE THE BUDGET SURPLUS

WASHINGTON.—Four years ago when I was first elected to Congress, I ran on the need for fiscal restraint in Washington, D.C., and a return of power to people back home. We

fought for our belief that we could balance the budget and provide tax relief for America's working families. For months we were told by Washington insiders and the media that it couldn't be done. Well, we proved them wrong, and we did it ahead of schedule.

Today Congress has a great opportunity as well as a significant challenge before it. A massive surplus of extra tax revenue is projected as a result of a balanced budget. The challenge lies in what Congress chooses to do with the budget surplus.

Saving Social Security is the first priority for the surplus. It's a bipartisan consensus. Last fall, House Republicans showed tremendous responsibility and leadership by passing a plan that earmarked 90 percent of the surplus for Social Security. President Clinton used this month's State of the Union message to call for setting aside a minimum of 62 percent of the surplus (\$2.7 trillion over 15 years) for Social Security.

Although we were prepared to set aside much more to save Social Security, Republicans agree to the president's request to set aside 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security. But the question remains of what to do with the rest. President Clinton proposes to spend it on big, new, expensive programs; Republicans want to give this back as tax relief.

Those who oppose tax cuts will fight tooth and nail against lowering today's tax burden. According to the U.S. Treasury, the total income tax take from individuals and families has increased 63 percent since 1992. In fact, according to the Tax Foundation, if you add up the local, state and federal tax burden, taxes are almost 40 percent of the average family's income. Wouldn't most people agree that today's tax burden is too high?

We can save Social Security and cut taxes at the same time. Some say we can't—they were the same ones who opposed balancing the budget and cutting taxes. We proved them wrong. For example, using only 25 percent of the surplus (allowing for an additional 13 percent of the surplus to be dedicated to shoring up Social Security or paying down the national debt) we could enact a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut for all American taxpayers while still eliminating the unfair marriage tax penalty and relieving family farms and family businesses of the inheritance or "death" tax.

The president's step gives us a window of opportunity to save Social Security. We commend the president for his new-found willingness to work with us to save Social Security, secure retirement savings, provide sorely needed tax relief and equip the next generation to compete in a global economy. But now that we have agreed on the first step in saving Social Security, we need to focus on the details. It is irresponsible to spend the people's surplus on new, big government programs. We must give this money back to the American people. Saving Social Security, paying down our national debt and offering real and substantial tax relief to all working Americans are three strong ways to spur our economy and lead the way into the next century.

U.S. Rep. Jerry Weller (R-Ill.)

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REQUIRING POST OFFICE TO OBEY LOCAL LAND USE LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as somebody who has worked for years on

helping communities find ways to promote livability, I am excited to see the attention that has been accorded lately to the livable communities movement.

It is clear that we do not need a lot of new rules and regulations and mandates and stipulations to be able to make sure that we achieve that goal. It is indeed the simplest step for us to take for the Federal Government to just be a constructive partner with State, local governments and the private sector, working with them to make communities work better. One small but important step would be to have Federal agencies like the post office obey the same rules and regulations requirements that we require on homeowners and businesses.

There are over 40,000 post offices all across America who are these little outposts that bring communities together, and there are opportunities from coast to coast, border to border to be able to promote livable communities by being constructive partners. Unfortunately, the post office has not always lived up to that ideal. Today, in the USA Today, there is an article about Tully, New York, and their struggle with the post office. Last week, it was Byron, California, and Discovery Bay.

Now, I bring this forward not with any animosity toward the Postal Service. To the contrary. I think it is terrific that we can, for less than a dollar, send three handwritten letters all across the country, have them be delivered in a matter of days, that they are delivered by employees who give back to the community, who usually do not just give the postal service but they do so with a smile.

It is a critical function that helps unite and bring people together. In fact, main street post offices are one of the anchors of small town America that add to the business district, that add to the flavor of those communities; and, in fact, that is why it is so important that the post office be a good citizen and a full partner for livability.

That is why my legislation has been endorsed by the Trust for Historic Preservation, by main street associations representing small- and medium-sized businesses all across the country, why the National Governors Association is concerned about this, why the post office itself has recently declared a moratorium on closing and is re-addressing its relationship with the community. They claim far fewer problems than in the past and that there is a new era under Postmaster Henderson.

I have met with the Postmaster General. I am impressed with his commitment, but I think the best way to express this commitment is to stop fighting this legislation and get behind it, to make clear its support for a new era of partnership.

Why should the post office be exempt from planning, zoning and building codes that homeowners and businesses in communities across the country

must adhere to? Why, since the post office is such a critical part of our community, should the community not be as involved with potential relocation issues as they are in helping pick which version of the Elvis stamp we are going to have?

I have discussed on the floor of this House in the past problems we have had in Leon County, Florida, where the Postal Service decided that it would not abide by the same groundwater environmental standards for runoff on their parking lot as other private businesses; or where in Ball Ground, Georgia, the Postal Service was not going to abide by a comprehensive plan to help metropolitan Atlanta deal with its critical environmental problems.

□ 1045

Well, after making, as it were, a Federal case out of it, the personal intervention, I think, of the Postmaster General, it looks like we are moving towards resolution in Leon County, Florida, and in metropolitan Georgia. But it should not have to be a major battle. It is time for the post office to stop fighting this legislation. It is time for the post office to institutionalize with us to make sure that the Postal Service is a full partner for the next millennium of livable communities in America.

Mr. Speaker, this small step can lead the way for the Federal Government itself across the country to provide that sort of partnership for livability.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 416, FEDERAL RETIREMENT COVERAGE CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement. I want to inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans in regard to H.R. 416, the Federal Retirement Coverage Corrections Act. The bill was favorably reported by both the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on Rules will meet on Wednesday to grant a rule which may require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which may limit amendments to the bill. In this case, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table by the close of legislative business on Wednesday. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to assure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House. It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify as long as the amendments comply with House rules.

Mr. Speaker, a Dear Colleague letter announcing this potential amendment process was mailed to all Member offices yesterday.

COMMANDANCY OF THE ALAMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise, as is tradition by members of the Texas delegation. Today is Texas Independence Day, and today I would like to follow in the tradition that has been done for years, to read a letter that was written from Colonel Travis, who was the commandant, who was the head of the Texans who were in the Alamo that was written on February 24, 1836, from Bexar in Texas.

To all people of Texas and all Americans in the world:

Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken. I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of liberty and patriotism and everything dear to the American character to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and to that of his country—victory or death.

Signed, William Barret Travis, Lieutenant Colonel Commander of the Texans in the Alamo.

P.S. The Lord is on our side. When the enemy appeared in sight, we had not three bushels of corn. We have since found in deserted houses 80 or 90 bushels and got into the walls 20 or 30 head of cattle.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

AMERICAN CITIZENS OF PUERTO RICO AND THE TERRITORIES MUST BE RECOGNIZED AS EQUALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of you saw the article "Talking About a Revolution" in Roll Call yesterday. The article highlighted the 45th anniversary of the attack perpetrated by a group of terrorists on the U.S. House of Representatives on March 1, 1954. Just like Russell Weston, Timothy McVeigh, Terry Nichols and others, the terrorists in the 1954 attack were also American citizens.

In commemorating such an anniversary, I wish that the same consideration to detail was provided on other issues concerning Puerto Rico. In our society it seems that it is the negative that consumes our attention, and it is a shame that this terrorist and cowardly act continues to be resurfaced without ever mentioning that the perpetrators were part of a small Fascist party then existing in Puerto Rico.

The article did not choose to highlight also that today, March 2, is the 82nd anniversary of the day when all Puerto Ricans and those born in Puerto Rico thereafter became U.S. citizens through an act of Congress and that it is also the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Puerto Rico regiment of volunteers which later became the 65th Infantry Army regiment, one of the most decorated U.S. Army units of this century. Thus, 100 years ago today, our predecessors in this U.S. Congress were discussing the issue of Puerto Rico and voted on and approved the organization of the first body of troops on the territory which they called the Porto Rico Regiment of Voluntary Infantry, 18 years before we were granted citizenship. We have been equals in war and death, but we are discriminated against in peace and life.

Our rights to liberty and free speech are intrinsic rights of our democracy that have been defended since our Nation's inception. As troops from the United States have fought to ensure and maintain freedom and democratic values everywhere and anywhere that has been needed in this world in this century, 197,034 soldiers hailing from Puerto Rico have fought shoulder to shoulder with our fellow citizens from every other State.

When we consider the century that binds us together, it is clear that the interrelationship between the United States and its citizens in Puerto Rico is most evidenced in our participation in defense of democracy. Military leaders such as General Douglas MacArthur, the supreme commander for the allied power during the Korean War, described it best:

"The Puerto Ricans forming the ranks of the gallant 65th Infantry on the battlefields of Korea by valor, determination and a resolute will to victory give daily testament of their invincible loyalty to the United States and the fervor of their devotion to those immutable standards of human relations to which the Americans and Puerto Ricans are in common dedicated. They are writing a brilliant record of achievement in battle, and I am proud indeed to have them in this command. I wish that we may have many more men like them."

It is unquestionable that every one of the 197,034 soldiers who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces take the responsibility as U.S. citizens very seriously, willing to give their lives for American democratic values. But their sacrifice would not have been possible without the patriotism and honor to duty evidenced by the support of their families

and all other American citizens in Puerto Rico. Who in my generation in America does not know the story of the Sullivan brothers in the Second World War? But how many Americans know that during the Korean War Mrs. Asuncion Rodriguez Acosta from the town of Juana Diaz, Puerto Rico, was the only American mother who had five sons serving in the Korean front at the same time?

Despite this brilliant record of gallantry and courage, the policy of the U.S. Government sets apart its 4 million American citizens in Puerto Rico and the territories. We are good enough to defend democracy throughout the world, but we are not good enough to have the same rights, nor good enough to receive the same benefits as all other American citizens in the 50 States. Are our sacrifices worth any less by virtue of living in a territory?

The bottom line is, can the United States continue to support a policy of discrimination in the Federal programs that are designed to protect our Nation's most needed citizens, be it in health, housing and economic prosperity?

A superficial mention of the terrorist attack dated 45 years ago only detracts attention from the real issues and should not be allowed to take the place of the in-depth discussions that the Nation should now be engaged in, including how and when to eliminate discrimination.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and I urge all of my colleagues to take the necessary steps to ensure that American citizens of Puerto Rico and the territories be recognized as equals and that we be granted equal consideration in all Federal programs together with our fellow citizens in the 50 States. Not only have we earned that right, but not to do so violates the most basic tenets of our democratic system which is based on the principle of equal rights to all. We cannot focus our attention on what a terrorist chooses to do and ignore the responsibility of Congress to direct a stop to discrimination. We must focus in our commitment to and the defense of our cherished American values.

THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL STATUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, as Congress this week begins the debate on reinstating the independent counsel law, I think, as a student of history, it is interesting to review what has taken place regarding that law.

Regarding congressional action on that matter certain questions are raised:

Should an administration investigate itself?

Should the alleged wrongdoing of a major administration official be left to

the attorney general or to a special counsel or an independent counsel?

Those are the questions that are now being asked as we face the expiration of the current independent counsel law.

Some say the problem is the law, some say the problem is the independent counsel. It is interesting to note, if we review history, what goes around comes around both in law and also in politics. A brief review of the independent counsel law, if folks would just take a moment to do that, reveals that we are about to return to where we started if the independent counsel law is not renewed.

Mr. Speaker, even in 1972, President Nixon suggested the appointment of a special prosecutor to investigate the Watergate scandal. As we know from history, President Nixon in 1973 also ordered the Attorney General to fire the Watergate special prosecutor. Those actions led Congress and President Carter to enact in 1973 an Ethics in Government Act. All totaled, the special prosecutor law was invoked 11 times from 1978 to 1982 with three appointments of special prosecutors.

In 1983, that law was revised and renewed for another 5 years. In 1987, with the Iran-Contra statute, when it came up for reauthorization, and although it gave great heartburn, President Reagan in December of 1987 signed the reimplementing bill into law. With three investigations during the Bush administration, President Bush let the statute expire in 1992.

With a new administration and new scandals, the Attorney General, Janet Reno, under the general law authority, appointed Robert Fisk as a special counsel, not an independent counsel, but under her general authority to investigate Whitewater, and she initiated that action on June 30, 1994.

Vowing to head up an administration with the highest ethical standards, President Bill Clinton took the step of being the first President since Carter to endorse the institution of an independent counsel law. On July 1, 1994, President Clinton signed the reauthorization bill and commented about the law, and let me quote from the President: "a foundation stone for trust between the government and our citizens." He dismissed charges that it had been, and I quote, "a tool of partisan attack and a waste of taxpayer funds." Instead, he said the statute was, and let me quote, "has been in the past and is today a force for government integrity and public confidence," end quote.

The Attorney General spoke before Congress, the same Attorney General who will be having the Department of Justice advocate the end of the independent counsel law, and stressed the government's and her own support for the bill, and let me quote what she said:

As a vehicle to further the public's perception of fairness and thoroughness, and to avert even the most subtle influence of what may appear in an investigation of highly-placed executive officials.

□ 1100

How interesting it is how the law comes around and goes around. How interesting it is that today the shoe is on the other foot. The administration is about to advocate the abolition of the Independent Counsel law. I think we just need to take a few minutes and look at history and see how people have taken various stands, depending on whose ox is getting gored.

I like to reflect on history, and I think this is a little lesson in history, particularly as it deals with the appointment of an Independent Counsel.

MEDICARE REFORM: DO NOT TAKE THE EASY WAY OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on the Future of Medicare will wrap up its work sometime this month. The Commission members were given the task of putting Medicare on solid financial footing. Unfortunately, they want to save Medicare by privatizing it.

Under the Commission proposal, Medicare would no longer pay directly for health care services. Instead, it would provide each senior with a voucher good for part of the premium for private coverage. Medicare beneficiaries could use this voucher to buy into the fee-for-service plan sponsored by the Federal Government, so-called traditional Medicare, or join a private plan.

The Commission proposal creates a system of health coverage, but it abandons the principles of comprehensiveness and egalitarianism that make Medicare such a valuable national program, an essential national service for America's elderly.

Today the Medicare program is income-blind. All seniors have access to this same level of care. The Commission proposal markets a class-based health care system of two-tiered health care: excellent care for the affluent, only barely adequate or worse health care for the less well off.

The idea that vouchers would empower seniors to choose a health plan that best suits their needs is a myth. The reality is that they will be forced to accept whatever health care plan that they can afford. Medicare beneficiaries have been able to enroll in private managed care plans for sometime now, and their experience, unfortunately, does not bode well for a full-fledged privatization effort.

Most managed care plans are for profit. The theory that they can sustain significantly lower costs than traditional Medicare simply is not panning out. Because managed care plans are profit-driven, they do not tough it out when those profits are not so forthcoming. We learned that the hard way

last year, when 96 HMOs deserted more than 400,000 seniors because the business did not meet their profit objectives.

Before the Medicare program was launched in 1965, private insurance was the only option for seniors, and more than half of them were uninsured. Insurers did not want to sign seniors up because they tend to actually use their health care coverage.

The private insurance market has changed a good deal since then, but it still avoids high-risk enrollees, and tries not to pay for high-cost services. The fact that 43 million Americans under age 65 are uninsured and the broad-based support for managed care reform in this Congress and all over the country should at the very least give us pause when we consider turning over the Medicare program to the private sector.

Medicare Commission leaders would also save Medicare money by raising the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67. It is interesting timing for such a proposal, given the growing number of uninsured in the 55 to 64 age range. These individuals cannot find an insurer now who will take them, and they were certainly a better risk as 55- to 64-year-olds for insurers than 65- and 66-year-olds.

Shell games simply do not work in health care. Someone still has to pay the bill when a person not yet eligible for Medicare becomes sick. Delayed care received in emergency rooms does not serve the individual or the public.

What is perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the Medicare Commission likely proposal is what it does not tell us. It does not tell us how we could make the current program more efficient while still maintaining its egalitarian underpinnings and its orientation in providing the right care to everyone, rather than simply the least expensive care.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Speaker. If we privatize Medicare, we are telling America that not all seniors deserve the same care. We are betting on a private insurance system that may not save us any money in the long run, and certainly minimizes care by avoiding individuals who are health care risks.

All this is to avoid the difficult questions. Selling off the Medicare program, privatizing Medicare, turning over America's best government program to insurance companies may be easy, but it is simply wrong.

AMERICA'S SALMON STOCKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue of great importance to me and to my constituents in Washington State. I have long been deeply concerned about our salmon

on stocks. I spent two summers working on salmon rehabilitation in Alaska more than 50 years ago. This little salmon pin that I'm wearing was a symbol for the organization my father started in 1949. I have not come just lately to an interest or commitment to salmon recovery.

Recently the Pacific Northwest salmon runs have drawn national attention as the Puget Sound chinook salmon has been proposed for listing as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act later this month. This listing could have a devastating impact on the economy and lifestyle we enjoy in the Northwest if we do not use our technology and common sense. Disaster can be averted if we are granted enough funding to make salmon recovery measures effective, and if we can continue to engage local communities in the fight.

Of course, we must utilize all of the available science and technology in our efforts to restore salmon populations. The people of the Northwest have been around salmon all their lives. I believe the will exists in our community not only to save but to enhance the salmon runs.

Grass roots organizations have sprung up all over the region to deal with this problem, and local governments in the area are forming their own recovery plans. As long as citizen involvement remains a part of the process and we rely on sound science and proper use of technology available, I am confident that salmon runs can be shepherd back to historic levels.

Federal dollars are absolutely essential if we are serious about restoring salmon runs. The President has included \$100 million in his budget to help the salmon recovery. While I am encouraged that the administration is turning its attention to this issue, the amount of money the President has announced is wholly inadequate to address the problem.

We cannot afford to waste time or money with small, ineffectual measures. A large investment is necessary now if we want to avoid larger costs in the future. It will be up to the Pacific Northwest to spend our salmon dollars wisely, to make good on our commitment to restore salmon runs.

Many people focus only on habitat restoration and natural spawning when talking about this issue. These are vitally important, but we must not lose sight of other elements in salmon recovery. Sound science and technology must play a crucial role in any plan. We cannot use 1924 technology to solve a 1999 problem.

During my lifetime we in the Pacific Northwest have developed salmon technology that has been successful around the world to accomplish miracles in salmon production in Japan, Chile, and Scotland. It would be foolish not to use it now in our own State. We know how to successfully use remote egg boxes, spawning channels, over-wintering sloughs, culvert mitigation, small

stream rehabilitation, the downstream migration of salmon stocks, returning adult salmon, and predator control, and, yes, hatcheries. We have the technological knowhow to avoid the pitfalls of the past. Thoughtfully and carefully, we can bring the salmon back if we use all the tools that are available.

Finally, our research into the life cycle of the salmon must continue. We do not know all the factors that have led to a decline in salmon populations, but we do know that more research is needed on the subject. More data must be included on the GIS maps. Research is needed on a variety of ocean and near-shore issues.

Bringing the salmon back to robust levels will not be an easy task, but with the determination of the citizens of the Northwest, combined with state-of-the-art technology and the proper level of Federal support, we will be able to accomplish our goals with minimal impact.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY, AND WHERE WE SHOULD GO FROM HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me join my colleague who spoke earlier to acknowledge Texas Independence Day, today, March 2nd, 1999. But as my 7th grader said, who has the challenge of studying Texas history, what a difference a century makes. I am very proud that we can stand before us today acknowledging Texas Independence Day, in a State that is diverse and recognizes all of the contributions that all of the citizens have made to this great State.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about where we should go from here. The impeachment process is over and the Constitution has been preserved. Although this week we will see a number of confessions and testimonies on television, I believe the American people want us to move forward. Now is the time for reconciliation and healing, mending and building relationships that were damaged that can be replaced.

Furthermore, I am ready to begin working toward enacting legislation that will enhance the quality of life for all Americans. The President's behavior, yes, was unacceptable, but they were not impeachable offenses of treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors. To dwell on that, Mr. Speaker, does not get us where we need to go.

I would simply like to ask us to get on with the people's business. There is great responsibility in saving social security and preserving Medicare. Social security is an obligation that Congress must protect now and in the future. Millions of Americans are depending

upon this program and its benefits. Social security is a lifeline for older Americans. It is time to get on with the people's business. It is time to address the crises in America.

I come from Texas. Today is its Independence Day. But it does not mean that I rejoiced or was proud of the act, the heinous act against James Byrd, Junior. I am proud of Jasper, Texas. I am proud of the conviction. I am proud of the laws of this Nation. But we need to do more to ensure that these heinous hate crimes are prevented, and that we as a Nation make a national statement against hate crimes.

I want to see the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 passed by this Congress expeditiously. I have named it after James Byrd, Junior, and Matthew Shepherd. I would like to collaborate with members of the Committee on the Judiciary and members of this House to pass once and forever a Hate Crimes Prevention Act in this country. How can we go forward and say that this was a heinous crime, and yet we do not want to act against it? There is documentation that there are increased hate crimes in America, and we must stand against them.

Just this morning I was in a hearing on Y2K and its relation to the compliance with Y2K needs for the Defense Department. Let me thank the Subcommittee on Technology of the Committee on Science and the oversight committee for looking at this important issue.

Many Americans are listening to disparate thoughts about this. Some say, prepare like it is a natural disaster. I say, get the United States prepared. We must work together in this Congress to ensure that we are not unprepared for Y2K.

The census must be done right, and I hope my Republican friends will join us and recognize that statistical sampling is the way to go. One American should not be left out. We have work to do.

I come from the oil patch, the energy sector. Many believe that the economy is going well, the engine of this country is strong. Let me tell the Members, there are over 50,000 people who have been laid off in the oil patch. We cannot leave them behind. I am appreciative of the Secretary of Labor, who will be working with me.

I look forward to my colleagues supporting the Jobs Protection Initiative Act, to get people back to work. I call upon the administration to make a strong stand to help those who have been laid off by low energy prices, and tell those laid-off individuals that they do count. We are going to work together and make a difference.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a world responsibility. I want to congratulate those who have come back from Nigeria and seen a positive count and democracy growing in Africa. I want us to pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act, to establish business bonds between small and medium minority and women-owned

businesses and Africans. I want to see peace in Ethiopia and Sierra Leone.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say one thing, as I proceed to the Committee on the Judiciary and a hearing later on this afternoon on the Independent Counsel.

My good friend mentioned the comments of President Clinton about the Independent Counsel being the foundation stone of trust between our government and its citizens. The gentleman is right, he did say that. But all of us say now that unfortunately, this past series of events with Mr. Starr and his activities have broken the bonds of trust.

□ 1115

I worked under Leon Jaworski, the special prosecutor for the Watergate proceedings. That is the standard of which we can comply. I believe this country can get rid of corruption, but we do not need to have an independent counsel that spends more time abusing the Constitution than supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I will go on record for looking forward to the independent counsel statute expiring and getting rid of a fourth estate of government and working with the Constitution and beginning to heal this Nation, making sure, of course, that we do not have corruption in government.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BROADCAST OWNERSHIP FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that I will be introducing the Broadcast Ownership for the 21st Century Act with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

Our bill will broadly deregulate the confining ownership limitations imposed by the FCC on the television broadcast industry. As we approach the dawn of a new century, it is time to reform the antiquated rules and regulations of the FCC that they cling to in an effort to replicate the communications world of the 1950s.

Mr. Speaker, today's entertainment choices are numerous and varied. There is cable. There is direct satellite broadcast. There is Internet. We are moving into high-definition television. Back in the 1950s, we had three, four, five channels; today we have over 200-plus channels, and many of them are digital.

We must allow our American corporations in the broadcast industry to compete in the international area as well. So the objective of our bill is deregulate and allow competition.

The FCC has failed to properly respond to a vastly different marketplace. This agency appears to be consumed with a regulatory model of gov-

ernment rather than the trimmed down, free-market approach that the American people would like and one that the rest of the world is beginning to embrace.

The modern economics of free, over-the-air television is rapidly changing. The local broadcasters and networks continue to see steady decline in viewers who are attracted to cable and satellite programming, or who are using the Internet more and more as an entertainment option.

In addition, the broadcasters and networks are faced with ever-increasing costs for programming, especially sports programming. Profitability and success hinges on their ability to create and own more and more of their own programming.

The broadcast industry has also begun their conversion to digital by beginning to deploy digital facilities. They have already begun delivering a digital signal in America's top markets. The industry will spend the better part of the next decade creating digital programming and transforming their facilities to an all-digital environment. The estimated cost of one digital television camera alone runs into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. When all is said and done, each individual broadcaster will have to spend millions and millions of dollars converting to digital.

Mr. Speaker, if we deregulate this industry, they will be able to compete and succeed. As everyone can see, the economics of the broadcast industry today are based upon increasing costs and shrinking profits. Unless that formula is changed, the era of free over-the-air television will never be the same.

What the American people have come to expect as quality network and local programming may be altered to a world of syndicated reruns and limited original programming. The heart and soul of America's favorite form of entertainment will become one based on pay services.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 attempted to provide relief for broadcast ownership. For instance, the Telecom Act asked the FCC to review all existing rules and regulations and eliminate those that were unnecessary. In addition, the act required the FCC to review the existing duopoly rules, which limit ownership to just one television station in a local market, in order to provide relief when needed. The act also specifically instructed the FCC to grandfather all television local marketing agreements, LMAs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, three years later, the FCC has failed to act and we need to move forward. Let us get the FCC to act today. This bill will provide a great nudge. The Stearns-Frost-Oxley bill will revise the duopoly rules to allow UHF-VHF ownership combinations in the same local market and to allow UHF-VHF combinations in separate local markets that may have overlapping coverage contours, such as in the

Washington, D.C. and Baltimore markets. This bill will also permanently grandfather all LMAs.

But, Mr. Speaker, within this bill, it still allows the FCC to have unusual powers. If the applicant demonstrates that permitting such ownership, operation, or control will not significantly harm competition or will not significantly harm the preservation of the diversity of media voices in the television market, then it will allow them to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, many nations prevent American companies from owning any percentage of their domestic broadcast industry. We must institute reciprocity and this bill starts this process now. Our bill will allow only those nations that will allow reciprocal ownership arrangements for American companies or individuals to move into American markets.

So this legislation will fundamentally change the economic dynamics of the broadcast industry to continue its vibrant tradition. To provide reciprocity. To help broadcasters to eliminate duplicative efforts. To make them more competitive and decrease regulation. That, Mr. Speaker, is the purpose of the bill.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

May Your blessing, O God, be with all who seek to serve in public service as elected leaders or as associates, in government service or in private endeavor. You have called each person, O gracious God, to use the talents and gifts that are theirs in ways that promote peace in our world and right attitudes and respect in our communities and neighborhoods. May not the words of understanding and reconciliation, of esteem and awareness, of freedom and liberty be the only words that we speak with our lips, but may those good words find home in our actions and in our hearts. May Your benediction, O God, be with those in public service and with every person now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

NATIONAL TRIO DAY

(Mr. DICKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the celebration of National TRIO Day this past Saturday, February 27. National TRIO Day was designated by concurrent resolution on February 24, 1986, by the 99th Congress. It is celebrated on the last Saturday of each February.

The TRIO program is a Federal program that works. Students volunteer their time to learn about how to better educate themselves, to become more gainfully employed. Employees of TRIO are there to help them and encourage them. This is for families that have income of under \$24,000.

We need more funds for this program so that we could fill more slots across the country. There are more people who want to get in the program than we have slots available.

One last thing, I would like to commend Lindsey Burkett of my hometown of Pine Bluff. She is in the Upward Bound program at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff and is the 16-year-old daughter of Nadine Burkett and the late Ray Burkett. She is a junior honor student at Dollarway High School. I want to commend her for her work and TRIO for it also.

READ ACROSS AMERICA DAY

(Mr. CUMMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Read Across America Day. The National Education Association, partnering with some of the Nation's leading literacy education and community groups, is calling for every child and every community in America to celebrate reading today.

Reading is critically important as a platform for future learning. As a father of a 4-year-old, I enjoy the positive emotional charge of our reading experience as she soaks in every word and picture. We are forming her pre-reading skills, and she will enter school prepared to read.

Unfortunately, there are thousands of children in America who do not have

their parents reading to them. Responsible adults must fill this gap for the sake of all of our children.

It is important that this Congress do all that it can to support and further child development from the rural communities of the heartland to the inner city of Baltimore, my home district. Today is a perfect opportunity to help all of our children reach their full potential.

CUBAN TRIAL CONVENED AGAINST FOUR DISSIDENTS WITH NO CHARGES FILED

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, for 594 days, Cuban dissidents Vladimiro Roca, Marta Beatriz Roque, Felix Bonne, and Rene Gomez Manzano have been behind Fidel Castro's prison bars, with no charges filed against them, for disseminating the document entitled, "The Homeland Belongs to All of Us," that dares to speak of counterrevolutionary beliefs, such as freedom, democracy, and human rights.

Yesterday, the regime began a kangaroo court trial behind closed doors against these four brave freedom fighters who face even more jail time. The trial of these four dissidents comes only days after the regime imposed a new law that severely punishes those who promote anti-revolutionary information.

Foreign diplomats and reporters who had expressed an interest in being present at this show trial were summarily dismissed. Foreign observers are not even allowed less than two blocks from the building in which these mock trials are being held.

On the eve of this mockery of justice, dozens of Cuban independent journalists and other dissidents, who risk their lives in an attempt to inform the international community about the reality inside Cuba, were arbitrarily arrested to prevent them from reporting on the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the last tyrant of our hemisphere is not about to change his totalitarian nature.

RUSSIA IS USING U.S. MONEY TO BUILD MISSILES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam gives billions to Russia. Russia builds missiles with our money. Russia then illegally dumps steel in America, destroying jobs in industry. Uncle Sam gives Russia more billions to stop the dumping.

Russia then takes this money and builds more missiles. This is no joke. The Pentagon says Russia has developed a new missile they call invincible because no system can stop it.

Beam me up here, ladies and gentlemen. Russian economy is so bad they cannot buy toilet paper, but they are building missiles threatening our freedom with our dollars. This is unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back all the bureaucrats who are sitting on their brains here in Washington, D.C.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY SOLD IN RETAIL BOOKSTORES

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, people would be astounded to learn in America that many public, commercial bookstores throughout the United States are allowed to sell child pornography. I am not talking about adult book stores.

I was shocked recently to learn that bookstores like Barnes and Noble and Borders are selling books that show young girls and boys completely nude in suggestive, erotic positions. These children are photographed alone or shown erotically entangled with other young children. Further, many of the captions for the pictures are sexually explicit.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage. Child pornography feeds the sick minds of child molesters who sexually prey on defenseless children who live in our neighborhoods.

What has the Clinton administration done to protect these children? They have turned a blind eye to some of the most offensive child pornography there is. The administration has not enforced Federal obscenity laws, after promising to make this a priority.

Please join me in calling on the administration to enforce our existing Federal obscenity laws.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to pass along some comments that my mother, Nancy Lampson, made to me after church just recently. She, like millions of other senior citizens, is worried about the future of Medicare and Social Security. She is afraid that it will not be there for me and my brothers and sisters.

My mother knows that saving Social Security and Medicare is not just good for retirement security for her. She knows it is also good for me, her grandchildren, and her great grandchildren.

Why? Because putting aside 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security and another 15 percent for Medicare will also reduce the national debt and reduce the billions of dollars we waste each year on interest payments. Winnowing down the national debt will be good for my mother's great grandchildren.

Currently, the United States of America spends nearly as much on interest payments as it does on national defense. If we wisely invest the surplus in Social Security and Medicare today, we can reduce our interest payments from 14 percent of the budget in 1999 to 2 percent in 2014.

Investing in Social Security and Medicare will not only reduce the debt but also will lower interest rates, boost the economic growth, and increase the financial security of working families. You do not have to be a Harvard economist to know that this makes good sense to the American people.

So, on behalf of my mother and the millions of Americans we represent, I urge all of you to invest in the present and the future by investing the budget surplus in Social Security and Medicare—it makes good sense for America.

OUR STUDENTS DESERVE THE BEST EDUCATION

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, I understand the importance of a good education and the foundation it builds for our youth. Our schools, both public and private, must establish curricula designed to challenge students and to reward classroom successes. American students, parents, and teachers must maintain the highest level of quality in the field of education.

Achieving this goal is possible when educational guidelines are drawn by parents and local school districts. It takes about 18,000 Federal and State employees to manage 780 Federal education programs in 39 Federal agencies, boards, and commissions at a cost of nearly \$100 billion annually.

It is thus not surprising that only approximately 70 cents of each dollar makes it directly to the classroom. We must do better. We must consolidate these programs and ensure that at least 95 percent of the funds are directed to the classrooms. Our students deserve the best possible education.

PUT OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE BACK IN ORDER

(Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on the fiscal situation in which we find ourselves and the opportunity that we have.

For 25 years, on a bipartisan basis, this government has mismanaged its financial house, its financial matters. We have, after 25 years, the opportunity to make fundamental progress. We have the opportunity to restore the nearly \$700 billion that has been, quote-unquote, borrowed from the So-

cial Security Trust Fund. We have the opportunity to put our fiscal house back in order. If we do that, it is not only good for the government fundamentally, it is good for the people of this country.

By reducing our interest payments, by reducing the demand on the credit market, we will do great things for the American people. The average cost of a home mortgage can be reduced by \$200 a month by adhering to the financial responsibility that we have the opportunity to pass this year in the Congress. I urge my colleagues, do it this year. Fix the financial situation. We have the opportunity. Do not let it lapse.

KEEP SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to challenge the other side to a pledge, a pledge that has been notably absent from the proposals of the other side of the aisle.

The Republican plan to protect and strengthen Social Security does not raise taxes, and it does not reduce benefits. The President's plan, however, leaves that option wide open. It would not take a rocket scientist or a fortune teller to figure out what that means.

The key issues for the current and future retirees is, will my retirement be secure and will Social Security remain a good deal? Social Security, unless dramatically reformed, fails on the first question.

As for the second, Social Security is a good deal for current retirees; but, very soon, it will be a terrible deal for future retirees.

The President's proposal does nothing about that. A worker's return on investment will continue to head down if real structural reforms are not made.

Let us keep Social Security solvent and a good deal for workers when they retire.

□ 1215

LION'S SHARE OF SURPLUS SHOULD PAY DOWN FEDERAL DEBT

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the position advocated by the President in his budget proposal that we use the lion's share of the surplus to pay down the Federal debt. The proposal to use 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security and 15 percent for Medicare will have that effect.

We have a chance for the first time in decades to begin to bring the debt held by the public, the money the Federal Government owes to other people, down to a level that we all try to exercise in our homes and businesses. This

will allow the Federal Government for the first time to more responsibly manage our debt and run the Nation's business.

Now, what impact does that have for those of us at home? In Hillsborough County, my home, the average mortgage balance on a home is about \$115,000. With a 2 percent drop in interest rates, which we can expect to occur as we begin to pay down the debt, a monthly mortgage payment could drop from \$844 to \$689. That is \$155 a month in the pocket of a homeowner that he or she would not otherwise have.

That is better than most any tax cut this Chamber could pass. It could be done by paying down the debt, using the lion's share of the surplus to protect Social Security and Medicare. I urge my colleagues to adopt that.

OPPOSE H.R. 45 TO PROTECT HEALTH AND SAFETY OF CITIZENS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 45, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1999, opens the door to the dangerous transportation of high-level nuclear waste and yet fails to address the concerns of the safety of millions of Americans.

By mandating the construction of an interim storage facility in Nevada, H.R. 45 would require the shipment of the most toxic substance known to man to go through 43 States. Fifty million Americans within a half mile of the transportation routes could be exposed to the deadly hazards of 77,000 tons of nuclear waste moving through their neighborhoods for the next 30 years.

H.R. 45 does nothing to address the weakness in the design of the waste caskets. It does nothing to fund the training of emergency personnel who would be required to respond to any accidents. H.R. 45 is the "speak no evil, see no evil, hear no evil" effort by the nuclear power industry to pull the wool over the eyes of Americans.

We must protect our constituents, their health and their safety and oppose H.R. 45.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mrs. Napolitano asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard about the need to dedicate the 62 percent of the surplus over the next 15 years to saving Social Security and then, of course, the 15 percent to saving Medicare, which cannot be understated.

However, in addition to that, we need to recognize that simply securing the solvency of Social Security and Medicare is not enough. We also need to address the structure and quality of Social Security and Medicare programs.

We need to discuss covering prescription drugs, a difficult issue because of the cost involved, yet vital for so many seniors in America.

We need to address the earnings test so that seniors who work to supplement their pensions are not penalized by cuts in their Social Security benefits.

We also need to talk about improving service so that individuals do not get lost in a bureaucratic cobweb that leaves them frustrated and without the benefits they deserve.

We have already agreed to dedicate the 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security in order to fully protect America's retirement security, but I urge my colleagues on the other side to take the next step and join us in resolving the entire Medicare issue.

AMERICA'S OIL INDUSTRY ON VERGE OF COLLAPSE

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with this picture? Today in America there is a total collapse, a crisis of survival for the oil industry. The small independent producers are going bankrupt every day bringing pain and hurt in oil patch.

What is wrong with this picture? American family farms are being destroyed. The families are having to leave because of low pricing and farm bankruptcies. Wheat just dropped to \$2.20 a bushel.

What is wrong with this picture? Today we are bombing Iraq but, at the same time, they are increasing by over 2 million barrels a day their oil sales which is helping destroy our domestic oil industry. Our small independent producers are dying in this country. They have also threatened and said they will not buy America's wheat with those funds from selling oil, again contributing to the collapse of the American farm.

I agree with my colleague from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) when he says, "Beam me up, Mr. President." What is wrong with this picture is Iraq is benefitting and our American farmers and independent producers are dying under the policy.

DO NOT FORGET ABOUT PAYING DOWN NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. SNYDER Tlasked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was in White County, Arkansas, a county that recently had some very devastating tornadoes, and was having my Saturday morning office hours in a store; and one of my constituents came through and what he wanted to talk about was our national debt. He said to me that, while we are all talking about

the surplus, he urged me to please not to forget paying down the national debt. He said, we are talking too much about surpluses, but we are forgetting the debt.

I think that is good advice from my constituent from Arkansas. If we use the surplus and pay down the debt, we will protect Social Security, we will protect Medicare, we will protect working families, and we will protect all generations that want to benefit from Social Security and Medicare in the future.

This is good common sense, Mr. Speaker, from White County, Arkansas; and I recommend this Congress heed my constituent's advice.

H.J. RES. 32, SOCIAL SECURITY GUARANTEE INITIATIVE

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be considering H.J. Res. 32, the Social Security Guarantee Initiative. I recently introduced this resolution that expresses Congress' commitment to protecting Social Security benefits for all current and future retirees. This bipartisan resolution sends an important message that sets the stage for what will soon be an historic debate on how best to reform our Nation's Social Security System.

I recently completed 21 town hall meetings during our congressional recess on a listening tour throughout Wisconsin's First Congressional District. At every stop a great number of people I represent expressed their grave concerns over any changes that would be made to the Social Security System. Quite frankly, many of them felt that Washington could not be trusted to fix their problem. We have to prove them wrong.

This resolution sends a very clear signal to our constituents that any reforms made by Congress will not result in a loss of benefits or place any increased costs upon them. Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we make this bipartisan commitment before we move forward on any Social Security reform proposals so that current and soon-to-be retirees will not have their benefits cut.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

REDUCING THE DEBT IS THE RIGHT THING TO DO

(Mr. HILL of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, \$17 billion is just a drop in the bucket here in Washington, but back in Indiana it is serious money.

Seventeen billion dollars is enough to operate all eight Indiana university

campuses for 10 years. Seventeen billion dollars almost equals the entire 2-year budget of the State of Indiana.

The government projects that this year we will spend \$17 billion less on interest payments than we did last year. When we reduce the government's debt, we are given billions of dollars back to the private sector to invest, create jobs and strengthen our economy. By reducing the debt, we are also improving our ability to honor the promises we have made to our seniors through the Social Security and Medicare programs.

Other arguments aside, reducing the debt we pass on to our children is just the right thing to do. Not only do we owe it to our American seniors to reduce the debt, but we owe it to future generations as well.

CONGRESS AND ADMINISTRATION SHOULD FOLLOW ICELAND'S LEAD

(Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the country of Iceland recently made the news with two separate announcements, one instructive and the other intriguing.

First, Iceland announced it will not sign, it will not sign, the U.N.'s questionable Kyoto climate treaty because it would destroy its economy and bring unnecessary suffering to its citizens.

Secondly, on February 17th, an Icelandic consortium signed an agreement for a joint venture to investigate the potential of transforming Iceland into the world's first hydrogen-based economy.

One of the first results could be a hydrogen fuel cell-powered bus service. This would be an interesting development to monitor because of the environmental and energy security implications. Hydrogen fuel cells create their own electrical energy, with clean water as a by-product. Some estimate that vehicle efficiency can be improved by 50 percent, with no exhaust emissions.

Mr. Speaker, it may be wise for Congress and this administration to follow Iceland's lead on both of these counts.

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO GET THE NATION'S FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, economists and the Congressional Budget Office agree: We have a budget surplus starting in the year 2001, which will grow to \$164 billion by the end of the year 2009.

Let me tell my colleagues when I talk to people in Oregon what they say about the budget. First of all, Oregonians believe we need to keep our budget

balanced, we need to pay off the huge national debt, and we need to make sure our future generations are not left holding the bag for our generation's party.

Leaving behind a debt that we did not have the moral fortitude to pay off is simply wrong. Reducing the national debt now, economists predict, will result in a further decline in interest rates. Now, let me tell my colleagues, lower interest rates are good for the homeowner, they are good for the businessperson, they are good for the farmer, and they are good for the student in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, last year we spent, listen to this number, \$243 billion, billion, of Federal taxpayers' money on the interest. That is four times what we spent on education. Four times. As a member of the House Committee on the Budget, I want to take this opportunity get our fiscal house in order.

HAITI'S FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS SHOULD HELP REVIVE HAITI'S FAILED DEMOCRACY

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today Haiti is a very grim place. The economy is in shambles, crime is prevalent, and the parliament is dysfunctional. There has been no progress scheduling necessary elections, despite President Preval's recent assurances he would.

Another indication of how bad the situation has become in Haiti is the Clinton administration's refusal to certify Haiti as meeting its obligation in the war on drugs, even though U.S. taxpayers have spent millions of dollars in the past few years trying to build a competent police force in Haiti.

Now we learn of the politically motivated murder, the brutal assassination of one of Haiti's nine remaining Senators on Monday. The predilection for solving Haiti's problems through violence continues as does the slide towards authoritarianism. Later this week I will join several of my colleagues in introducing a bipartisan resolution calling on the Organization of American States to intervene.

The crown jewel of Clinton's foreign policy is tragically tarnished. It is time we stopped adding more to this bad debt.

PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with an historic opportunity. Due to a robust economy, the Federal Government has a surplus for the first time in three decades. We should seize this moment to do what is fair, right and fiscally responsible: Protect Social Security and Medicare.

Social Security and Medicare are the twin pillars of retirement security. Two-thirds of our seniors rely on Social Security for over half of their income. Medicare ensures that 99 percent of our seniors have the health coverage that they need. Combined, these two programs allow our parents to live with dignity, independence and peace of mind.

Now that we have the opportunity, we should use the vast majority of this surplus, a full 77 percent, to strengthen Social Security and Medicare for the long-term security of our parents, ourselves and our children.

Protecting Social Security and Medicare must come before a Republican tax plan, which would spend the surplus on a one-time, feel-good tax break that benefits mostly the wealthy. It is irresponsible and it is risky. Let us not jeopardize the long-term health of Social Security and Medicare for the short-term goal of an overzealous tax break.

Let us do what is right, let us protect Social Security and Medicare.

PAYING DOWN NATIONAL DEBT ENSURES PRESERVATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. In 1992, Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton took office, we were looking at budget deficits that were approaching almost \$300 billion. Well, thanks to the good work of Congress and the good work of the administration, we are no longer talking about budget deficits, but we are, in fact, talking about budget surpluses.

It is important for us to continue down the path of fiscal responsibility, and that requires this Congress to support the efforts of the administration and others who are committed to using the significant majority of the budget surpluses that we are going to see in the next 10 years to pay down the national debt and, in doing so, ensuring that we can preserve Social Security and Medicare.

That makes good sense for our families and makes good sense for our businesses. Because if we pay down the national debt, which is costing us \$243 billion a year in interest, we will be ensured that we can see a reduction in interest rates of over 2 percent. A reduction of 2 percent in interest rates means about \$155 to people who have a home mortgage of \$115,000.

□ 1230

It means to farmers of this country, who have an operating loan of \$250,000, a \$5,000 savings. Let us take the path of fiscal responsibility. Let us pay down the debt.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL
LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY,
FISCAL YEAR 1997—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Government Reform:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 701 of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-454; 5 U.S.C. 7104(e)), I am pleased to transmit the Nineteenth Annual Report of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for Fiscal Year 1997.

The report includes information on the cases heard and decisions rendered by the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the General Counsel of the Authority, and the Federal Service Impasses Panel.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1999.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, February 23, 1999.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, on Feb. 12, 1999, I was appointed by the House Democratic Caucus to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. According to Rule 19 E of the Rules of the Democratic Caucus, "no Democratic Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence may serve on more than one standing committee during the Member's term of service on the select committee."

Rule 19 E also states that "Members shall be entitled to take leaves of absence from service on any committee (or subcommittee thereof) during the period they serve on the select committee and seniority rights on such committee (and on each subcommittee) to which they were assigned at the time shall be fully protected as if they had continued to serve during the period of leave of absence."

Accordingly, I am requesting a leave of absence from the House Committee on Science for the 106th Congress, with the understanding that my seniority rights on the Committee will be fully protected in accordance with Rule 19 E of the Democratic Caucus. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

TIM ROEMER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to the provisions

of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

PERMITTING CERTAIN YOUTH TO
PERFORM CERTAIN WORK WITH
WOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 221) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to permit certain youth to perform certain work with wood products, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 221

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION.

Section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(7)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), in the administration and enforcement of the child labor provisions of this Act, it shall not be considered oppressive child labor for an individual who—

"(i) is at least 14 but under the age of 18, and

"(ii) is a member of a religious sect or division thereof whose established teachings do not permit formal education beyond the eighth grade,

to be employed inside or outside places of business where machinery is used to process wood products.

"(B) The employment of an individual under subparagraph (A) shall be permitted—

"(i) if the individual is supervised by an adult relative of the individual or is supervised by an adult member of the same religious sect or division as the individual;

"(ii) if the individual does not operate or assist in the operation of power-driven woodworking machines;

"(iii) if the individual is protected from wood particles or other flying debris within the workplace by a barrier appropriate to the potential hazard of such wood particles or flying debris or by maintaining a sufficient distance from machinery in operation; and

"(iv) if the individual is required to use personal protective equipment to prevent exposure to excessive levels of noise and saw dust."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 221, which is a bipartisan bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ). The bill will address a unique problem resulting from the application of the child labor provisions of the Fair

Labor Standards Act to individuals in the Amish community.

We are considering a substitute amendment which makes one technical change for the purpose of renumbering the paragraphs in the bill.

My colleagues will remember that the House passed a similar bill, exactly the same, as a matter of fact, last year by voice vote under suspension of the rules. The Senate did not consider the bill prior to the close of the last Congress, and so we are taking early action on the bill in order to allow ample time for the Senate to act.

Children in the Amish community complete their formal classroom education at age 14 or 15. In fact, the Amish faith teaches that their children's formal classroom education should end after the eighth grade, after which they, quote, learn by doing, while working under the supervision of their parents or another community member.

Amish youth have traditionally worked in agriculture on their family farms. However, economic pressures in recent years, including the rising cost of land, have forced more and more Amish families to enter other occupations. Many have gone into operating sawmills and other types of woodworking. So, increasingly, the opportunities for Amish young people to "learn by doing" are in these types of workplaces.

The problem is that the Department of Labor's regulations prohibit 14- and 15-year-olds from working in any sawmill or woodworking shop and severely limit the work of 16- or 17-year-olds in these workplaces.

The Department has undertaken a number of enforcement actions against Amish employers in recent years. As a result, Amish youth no longer have the opportunity to learn skills and work habits through the community's traditional means.

We have no reason to believe that Amish young people will be placed at risk or allowed to engage in unsafe activities in the workplace. As some of my colleagues have said, who would care more about the well-being of Amish children than their parents? The fact is that, as the Amish struggle to preserve their way of life, the Department of Labor's actions are, in effect, undermining the Amish culture.

H.R. 221 is a narrow bill that addresses this specific problem. It would allow individuals who are at least 14 years old to work in sawmills and woodworking shops, so long as they do so under the supervision of an adult relative or member of the same faith. The young person would not be permitted, under any circumstances, to operate or assist in the operation of any power-driven woodworking machines.

The young person must be protected from wood particles or other flying debris by a barrier or by maintaining an appropriate physical distance from machinery in operation. In addition, the young person must be protected from

excessive levels of noise and sawdust by the use of personal protective equipment.

I want to particularly commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) for their work on this issue. This legislation comes only after Members of Congress made repeated effort to work out an administrative solution with the Department. Unfortunately, the Department has been unwilling or unable to alleviate the conflict between the current regulation and the Amish community's way of life. That is why we are now addressing the problem through legislation.

The bill will allow the Amish to continue in their traditional way of training their children in a craft or occupation while ensuring the safety of those who are employed in woodworking occupations. I would certainly urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan legislation.

I would also indicate that I believe it is our responsibility to legislate. It is the responsibility of the Court to determine whether it meets Amish law or American law, not the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 221. This bill permits 14-year-old children to work in sawmills, one of the most dangerous worksites in the country. The occupational fatality rate in the lumber and wood products industry is five times the national average. The fatality rate exceeds that of the construction, of the transportation and of the warehouse industry.

Inexperience, small size and lack of maturity can all act to increase the risk of accidents for 14-year-old children employed in sawmills.

I oppose this bill because it poses undue jeopardy to the health and safety of children too young to legally smoke, too young to legally consume alcohol products, too young to defend this country in the military.

Mr. Speaker, there are good, sound, logical reasons why 14-year-olds are prohibited from engaging in these activities, and the same reasons exist for keeping them out of sawmills.

I also oppose this legislation because it undermines job opportunities for adults by encouraging the replacement of older workers with teenagers who will work for less pay. Mr. Speaker, replacing fathers with their sons was a pervasive and devastating pastime for the robber barons of American industry at the beginning of the 20th century. Why are we contemplating renewing this horrendous policy at the beginning of the 21st century?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because it violates the establishment clause of the Constitution's first

amendment, which forbids preferences to one religion over another. This bill, if enacted, will sanction a discriminatory provision of law for the Amish members against other religions that do not enjoy this preference. I am sympathetic to the desire to accommodate the Amish lifestyle but am opposed to accommodating that lifestyle in a manner that places other religious groups and business interests at a disadvantage.

Encouraging the displacement of adult workers by teenagers in this hazardous worksite is bad safety policy, is bad health policy, is bad employment policy and, most of all, Mr. Speaker, it is bad constitutional policy. I oppose the bill because it is an assault on the very principle enacted years ago to prevent the exploitation of child labor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this ill-conceived, unnecessary bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the coauthor of the legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today we are addressing an issue important to the Amish community who reside in over 20 States in this country, and I especially want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and the other Members who have helped us craft this bipartisan bill.

People around the world know of the Old Order Amish as people who till their land and direct their lives with faith, simplicity and discipline.

Traditionally, Amish communities are centered around the family farm, which requires input from the whole family. While caring for crops and animals, Amish parents show their children how to make a living without exposure to outside influences that contradict their beliefs. However, due to the high growth rate, the soaring price of farmland, many Amish have been forced to look for alternatives to farming. Now Amish can be found in small businesses making raw lumber, clocks, wagons, cabinetry and quilts.

Therefore, as they did on the family farm and still do, and I might say that in farm work the children are totally exempt from child labor laws, one can find a 10-year-old boy driving a team of mules. I would like to see the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) try that. The Amish now wish to have their youth work with them in these vocational settings.

Typically, the youth will learn a trade after the completion of Amish school, or the eighth grade, and be self-sufficient by age 18. The Amish view this work as part of their schooling, since they often accompany a parent to the workplace, very similar to an apprenticeship, and they call this learning by doing.

Unfortunately, these small Amish-owned businesses have received costly

finances from the Department of Labor for having their young adults work alongside their fathers and uncles, even in family businesses.

Mr. Speaker, recently a businessman, an Amish businessman in my congressional district, was fined \$10,000 for having his own child in the front office of his business. The teenager, 15 years old, was simply learning to use the cash register alongside her father. She was far from harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, these actions by the Department of Labor have severely threatened the lifestyle and the religion of this respected and humble community. The Amish expect diligence, responsibility and respect from their youth. They do not contribute to the social ills of our society, and they do not accept any assistance from government programs.

Our government should not interfere with this humble community. Several of my colleagues, along with our Amish constituents, met with the Department of Labor several times last year for a solution. Unfortunately, we received nothing but negative responses from Labor. The Amish have a very unique situation, and they do not benefit from shop or vo-tech like the youth of our schools.

My son, at age 14, made furniture on a band saw in a shop class with 15 other students around. We have a responsibility to evaluate the Amish in light of these things, and that is why the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and I and others have introduced this legislation, narrowly crafted, and we urge support.

□ 1245

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise to oppose the bill, particularly on suspension. I offered an amendment in committee to try to make this bill a little better by having a reporting requirement, that it would be reported the number of injuries that might take place in this type of workshop with this reduced age limit so we could determine what the effect of this bill might be. Now, that amendment was defeated on a pretty well party line vote in the committee. We are precluded from offering, I think, and even discussing that amendment here on the floor under this suspension of rules. So I feel that the process is wrong.

I have serious problems about the bill, but we cannot even discuss the amendment that was defeated by a party line vote in committee. I urge defeat of the bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in the House today and support this legislation. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS),

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and all of those who were a part of bringing this issue together.

We should not be here today. The Department of Labor and Industry should not be in this issue. There was not a history of danger out there, not a history of people being harmed. A lot of the criticism, or all of it has been about safety. This legislation includes supervision by an adult relative or an adult of the same religious sect; the placement of protective barriers. We just heard that the lumber industry is the most dangerous. Yes, it is. The most dangerous part is the falling of trees. They are not going to be doing that. The next most dangerous part is running saws and planers and equipment. They are not going to be doing that. They are going to be doing odd jobs in the mill, stacking lumber, cleaning up, office work, running errands, helping out, learning a trade.

Young people in the Amish community when they are finished with school at 14, they learn a trade and when they work around the edges of a mill, when they work around the edges of an operation, they learn that business over a period of time. We are not putting them in harm's way. In my view, this is legislation that is needed to be done to preserve the Amish life. As someone just mentioned, they are not a part of the difficulties in our society. They are a quiet people who teach their youth to work and carry on whatever the tradition of that family was. This is a very sensible, well-thought-out solution that will allow this community to preserve its way of life.

I urge the Members of this Congress to tell the Department of Labor and Industry to go on and deal with real problems and leave our Amish to raise their children as they have in the past with a very good record.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, last September this body considered a piece of legislation identical to this bill before us today. Then as now, I support the bill very much. You might ask why someone from an urban area like myself would support a bill such as this, because there are no Amish in Los Angeles County. Well, I do not care where you live in this country, when it comes to keeping our young people engaged productively and out of trouble, the challenges are the same no matter where you are. And although the answer is different in different parts of the country, the goal is the same, to keep those kids out of trouble, keep them working, keep them interested in something that will make a good life for themselves.

I supported that bill last year, because I understand the Amish way and where they face problems that are different than those that we face in Los

Angeles, I believe that for their youth, they have the appropriate answer. And I supported the bill because it offers a real solution to a real problem for the Amish and because it made good sense to me.

As I mentioned during the debate last September, Amish children finish their education at 14 years of age. Historically Amish boys have joined their fathers in the fields of the family farm. However, due to technological advances, the rising price of real estate, the Amish have found it difficult to compete and many have had to abandon their farms for other types of occupations. Today nearly 50 percent of the Amish men work in nonfarm occupations, primarily in the lumber industry. However, when the Amish take their young men to work with them in the sawmills, they are in violation of child labor law.

Therefore, last Congress the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) introduced a bill to amend the child labor laws to permit the Amish to take their young men to the sawmill with them. In response to this concern about exposing young men to hazards that has been mentioned here by a couple of Members, we saw that, too. We wondered if we were not doing the same. But we worked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) to come up with a solution to that problem. I worked with him to add a number of safety provisions such as requiring earplugs, face masks, adult supervision, et cetera. We must have done a good job because it passed out of committee by a voice vote and passed on the floor by a voice vote. Because the Senate ran out of time is the only reason we are here considering this noncontroversial legislation again.

This bill before us is identical to the bill that was passed by the House in the last Congress. It addresses the same problems and contains the same safety provisions and still makes good sense. Therefore, although you may not have a large number of Amish in your district, I urge you to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me this time and I rise in support of this legislation. I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) for exercising common sense and bipartisanship in crafting this legislation. It is extremely important that we strike a

delicate balance between honoring the differences in our different religions in this country, our different traditions in this country and having a safe and healthy workplace. I believe this legislation, in a commonsense and bipartisan manner, strikes this principled compromise between these two interests, of respecting the Amish for their cultural and religious differences and on insisting on a safe and healthy work environment.

The Amish community, as has been stated on the House floor here this afternoon, has a little bit different education system than some of the rest of us, and we should respect and honor those differences. They have a formal education for their young men and young women up until about the eighth grade, and then after the eighth grade many of their children, young minors, are enrolled in informal vocation classes learning directly under the supervision of parents and teachers.

In Indiana, let me give my colleagues an example, this is primarily done in small cabinet-making shops where people have worked with the Amish community for decades and where they are small, family-owned businesses. This is not an instance where young people are out in harm's way from falling trees or with big sawmills. They are in working environments in small business communities.

We have four major protections outlined in this bill that I will not go into articulating but I will again urge this body to support this bipartisan, commonsense bill.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK).

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I get nervous when I find myself on the opposite end of a labor issue from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), but in this instance I come from a different perspective. I grew up in a small town called Summit Mills in southwestern Pennsylvania. That town is mostly Amish. And so as I grew up in that community as a young man, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 years of age, I worked in Amish farms, I worked in Amish sawmills, I worked and learned carpentry with my friends the Amish. I worked in their maple sugar camps. I understand their way of life because I lived it with them. I know that there is no danger. I also know that if they do not employ their children, it does not mean that they are going to employ someone else, it means they are going to work that much longer and that much harder themselves or they are not going to make that much more money. They are going to in fact have to live with less.

In my district now, the 4th District of Pennsylvania, in Lawrence County, the Amish live there, they are quiet people, they do not drive cars, they do not listen to radio or watch TV. But what they do is when their children are finished with school at the eighth

grade, they teach their children how to make a living. They in essence are the trade school themselves. If the family business is carpentry, if it is a sawmill, if it is a maple sugar camp in the spring, if it is farming, they teach their children to do this. If the children have other interests, they may go off and work with an uncle or someone else on their farm.

This bill, H.R. 221, of which I am an original cosponsor, does specify that the young Amish people would not be permitted to operate power-driven woodworking machinery. Regarding the workplace safety of this bill, the bill requires a barrier or some other means of protection to be used to protect these teenagers from flying wood particles.

I have a very strong voting record to maintain our labor laws. This bill simply amends the Fair Labor Standards Act and would allow these young people ages 14 to 18 who are members of this religious sect to work with their parents, to work with adults, those who are like the Amish to be able to be employed in a family business where wood is processed with machinery.

I ask my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 221.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I rise today in support of this bill. I believe this is a commonsense measure allowing the Amish to preserve their culture as well as the control of the upbringing of their children while maintaining important child labor enforcement policies.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) for the leadership that they have shown in crafting what I think is a very commonsense measure. To this day the Amish continue to make great contributions to our Nation's heritage across the country and as well in my congressional district in western Wisconsin. Traditionally Amish children's formal education ends at a very early age. They continue to learn by doing. Their youth attend school until the age of 14, after which they work with an adult member of the community to gain hands-on experience, oftentimes in small, family-owned woodworking shops. In the past the practice has come into conflict with certain child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Yes, woodworking machines can be very dangerous, especially for young children, but thanks to my colleagues I think there have been some common-

sense safeguards built into this legislation that we can all support. First, that teenagers must be supervised by an adult who is a member of the same sect or division; second, the teenagers are not allowed to operate or even assist in the operation of power-driven woodworking machines; and, finally, they must be protected by an appropriate barrier to the potential hazard of flying debris and wood particles.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to do all that we can to preserve our Nation's distinct and diverse heritage without sacrificing personal safety and well-being, especially when it comes to the safety of our children. I believe this bill is a commonsense step in that direction. Therefore, I urge my colleagues today to support what I feel is an appropriate bill with the appropriate safeguards.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, too, want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) as well as our bipartisan help from the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) and others on the other side of the aisle who have helped to finally bring this remedy hopefully to closure this year.

For the record, I want to say I am not just a bystander in this. Not only do I represent the 3rd, 7th and 10th largest old order communities in the country, and by old order I mean that they do not have tops on their buggies and they are not allowed to marry the Amish in many of these other gentlemen's districts who have tops on their buggies and are much, therefore, more liberal Congressmen and members. Furthermore, this has nothing to do with voting. Out of the 20,000 Amish in my district, I think approximately 150 voted. Three in my hometown of Grabill went out to vote and then got kicked out of church for going out because they wanted to vote for me and they had to work that through in their church. My great grandfather in 1846 was one of the first Amish settlers in Allen County. He left the Amish faith around the turn of the century, but I still have many cousins and many, many friends in the Amish community and I grew up in a small town surrounded by an old order Amish community and went to school with many of them.

So I have been very involved with this issue even though the original points of contention with the Department of Labor came up in Pennsylvania and most of the Amish who were at the meetings that we had with the Department of Labor were from Pennsylvania, a few from Holmes County,

Ohio, and very few from Indiana and mostly up from the district of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) because the Amish in my district do not take part in any governmental activities and therefore are completely vulnerable and helpless when the government comes in and tries to alter their life-style.

For 18 months we have negotiated with the Department of Labor. We have negotiated through several rounds through our committee.

□ 1300

I am frustrated how long this has taken. This is a tad ridiculous, quite frankly. At the same time, I am glad we are to this point, and I am glad we are finally making progress.

We have heard particulars in this bill, that in fact this is an endangerment. It is not a question of whether the Amish are old enough to smoke or old enough to do many things, because they are certainly old enough to sweep a floor. This is not a matter of working the woodworking equipment. It is a matter of doing the tangential jobs. We, as my colleagues have heard, put restrictions that limit that endangerment.

Furthermore, as we see the pressures in our communities in Indiana, in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, where there are Amish communities, we have a fundamental question we have to answer in this country: Can you practice religious freedom within the confines of what we expect in public health and safety? As they cannot divide their farms any further, they have turned to other crafts like woodworking, and if they cannot practice woodworking, and if they cannot practice their religious faith, they will leave our country or have to change their religion, and that is not what America was based on.

I would argue that many of the arguments that have been put forth through the past few years are absurd. I have seen in print that there could be forklifts running over these kids. They do not have forklifts in Amish factories because they do not have electricity. I just heard a reference to robber barons. As my colleagues know, the Amish parents are not robber barons, and we have to be very careful about confusing past labor disputes with one of the most innocent, helpless and vulnerable segments of our society. I do not understand how anybody could oppose these poor, low-income people, who are at the mercy of everybody else, having their ability to work with their children in their factories.

So, in their woodworking, whether it is furniture or whether it is pallets or whatever they do, so that they can continue their way of life, they are not the people with the gang problems, they are not the people with drug problems, they are not the people with the social problems we see elsewhere. So why would we come barreling into their community and try to change their

lifestyle when they should be a model for the rest of us, not somebody who we try to destroy their culture?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of this important legislation, I urge my fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 221. The bill amends the Fair Labor & Standards Act to allow youths between the ages of 14–18, who are members of a religious sect or division, to work in businesses where machinery is used to process wood products.

This legislation is of great importance to me since my district has the greatest population of Amish residents in Illinois. Instead of continuing formal education past the 8th grade, Amish children typically go to work with their parents or another adult learning a trade, usually woodworking or farming. This is not an example of "sweatshops" where children are forced to work against their will—this is a tradition that the Amish community has held near and dear to their hearts.

Current FLSA language allows the Department of Labor to levy fines up to \$20,000 on several Amish businesses, and to confiscate their equipment. This is not only a financial hardship that small business must absorb, but an imposition on secular values. This is not the role of government.

This legislation allows Amish children to begin their life's work under the proper supervision of an adult and requires the youth to be properly protected in the various work areas. We should not penalize a religious community and their citizens from pursuing life-long traditions.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 221.

This bill permits children to work in one of the most hazardous industries in the country. Fourteen-year-old children do not possess the full autonomy of choice and may not possess the full capacity for choice possessed by adults. They should not be allowed to place themselves or be placed by others in occupational situations that may be life threatening. The occupational fatality rate in the Wood Products Industry is five times higher than the national average. One of the witnesses who testified on behalf of this legislation told of how he lost several fingers when during a moment of inattention, he carelessly set his hand on a conveyor belt and it ran his hand into a saw. This accident happened to an adult with years of experience in the wood processing industry. Inexperience and lack of maturity serve to make the potential risks faces by minors even greater than they are by minors even greater than they are for adults. It is unreasonable to expect a fourteen year-old to maintain the kind of continuous safety concern we expect for adults. In this industry, a moment of inattention can be fatal. Secretary Herman in a letter to Chairman GOODLING opposing this legislation said, "While we are sensitive to the cultural and religious traditions of the Amish and similar American communities, we believe the benefits of accommodating those traditions must be carefully balanced against the nation's longstanding concern for the safety and welfare of children." Secretary Herman provides the focus which should guide this Congress in its deliberations concerning child-labor issues. We should always place the protection of our children's health and safety first.

To employ children in an industry where the occupational fatality and injury rates are five times the national average is irresponsible. If enacted, H.R. 221 will inevitably result in the serious injury or death of a minor. Attached for the RECORD are letters from the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the passage of H.R. 221, legislation which will permit a unique culture to continue practicing traditions vital to its way of life. This bill changes current law so that Amish teenagers may continue work in businesses where machinery is used to process wood products.

Child labor provisions in the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) prevent Amish young people from learning the practical skills they need to successfully contribute to their community. The U.S. Department of Labor has followed a rigorous enforcement policy in the arena of child labor. The Department of Labor has levied fines of up to \$20,000 on several Amish businesses. These actions are not just intrusive, they are insulting to a proud culture which has long prospered within the boundaries of our laws.

While enforcement of child labor laws is laudable and necessary, it is detrimental to the Amish people. In their culture, Amish youth finish organized schooling at the age of 14, when they go to work with their parents or other adults in their community to learn a trade. Due to the nature of their lifestyle, these occupations are primarily in agriculture and woodworking, work which requires long periods of apprenticeship to learn the proper and safe use of the required machinery.

H.R. 221 recognizes this fact by providing specific requirements for the sake of safety—requirements that the Amish have implemented long before the Fair Labor Standards Act came into effect. Individuals working in these trades must be between the ages of 14 and 18, and be a member of a religious sect or division which mandates no formal education beyond the eighth grade. Other provisions include the proper wear of protective gear, as well as proper adult supervision at all times.

The Amish are a people who take great pride in their secular values, and rightfully take great umbrage to any attempts to influence their lifestyle. I am thankful that we in the Congress can take pride in the fact that today we did the right thing, and corrected an error in bureaucracy which threatened the culture of a group of people.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 221, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 221, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DISASTER MITIGATION COORDINATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 818) to amend the Small Business Act to authorize a pilot program for the implementation of disaster mitigation measures by small businesses.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 818

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Disaster Mitigation Coordination Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by adding "and" at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) during fiscal years 2000 through 2004, to establish a disaster mitigation program to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred (guaranteed) basis) as the Administrator may determine to be necessary or appropriate to enable small business concerns to implement mitigation measures pursuant to a formal disaster mitigation program established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, except that no loan or guarantee may be extended to a small business concern under this subparagraph unless the Administration finds the concern is otherwise unable to obtain credit for the purposes described in this subparagraph."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) DISASTER MITIGATION PILOT PROGRAM.—The following program levels are authorized for loans under section 7(b)(1)(C):

"(1) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

"(2) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

"(3) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

"(4) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

"(5) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2004."

(c) EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On January 31, 2003, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit to the Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the pilot program authorized by section 7(b)(1)(C) of the Small Business Act, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall include—

(1) information relating to—

(A) the areas served under the pilot program;

(B) the number and dollar value of loans made under the pilot program; and

(C) the estimated savings to the Federal Government resulting from the pilot program; and

(2) such other information as the Administrator determines to be appropriate for evaluating the pilot program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT).

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I begin by thanking my colleague, the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), for her assistance in moving this bill and also my colleague from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for his assistance in handling it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 818, the Disaster Mitigation Act of 1999, is a common-sense approach to applying the principle of preventive care in coping with natural disasters. H.R. 818 is substantially identical to a measure reintroduced by Senator CLELAND, the measure which actually passed the Senate last year. It is part of the administration's budget request, and it has substantial bipartisan support.

Since 1953, the Small Business Administration has administered the Disaster Loan Program authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act. This program provides loans to help small businesses rebuild after natural disasters.

In past years, the loan program has spent billions of dollars helping small businesses recover from natural disasters. For example, in fiscal year 1998, the SBA lent \$728 million for 30,154 disaster loans. In 1997, it lent \$1.1 billion for 49,515 disaster loans. In 1994, the SBA's highest demand came when it loaned over \$4.1 billion for damage done due to the Northridge Earthquake in California. It was important, Mr. Speaker, that we do this to help people recover from the damage inflicted by natural disasters.

We should also recognize that the cost of disaster assistance has risen over the past several years due to increases in construction and other costs, and it is clear that efforts must be made to help prevent this kind of damage in the first place, both to prevent the human injury and toll and also to hold down costs to the taxpayers. Implementing the program to help small businesses use techniques to lessen damages caused by natural disasters offers the potential to save much anguish for many people across the United States and also to save millions of dollars in the future.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency currently manages Project Impact which works in conjunction with communities and businesses on such mitigation policies and techniques. Passage of H.R. 818 will complement and further these efforts at mitigation by offering small businesses low-interest loans for disaster mitigation through the Small Business Administration.

H.R. 818 authorizes the SBA to establish a pilot program to make loans to small businesses for purposes of mitigating the effects of natural disasters. These loans will be made in support of the mitigation program established at the Federal Emergency Management

Agency. The mitigation techniques are varied. They include a wide range of activities, including building improvements, relocation and the like.

H.R. 818 will authorize SBA to lend up to \$15 million each year through fiscal year 2004 in support of the Disaster Mitigation Pilot Program. These funds will come from existing section 7(b) disaster loan appropriations and will be subject to appropriations available for that program, so the bill does not authorize any new Federal spending.

Finally, H.R. 818 will require the SBA to report to Congress on January 31, 2003. The report will document the number of loans made, the areas served by the pilot and the estimated savings to the government as a result of the program.

I want to again thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), and my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), for their assistance in moving the measure before us. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 818.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my distinguished colleague from the great State of Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, for his work in bringing this bill to the floor today and for his initiative in seeking measures to assist and prevent disasters throughout the country. I would also like to thank my colleague from New York, the distinguished ranking member, who has joined in working to prevent disasters and provide assistance for the victims of disasters.

Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about the need to adequately support people whose lives have been devastated by natural disasters. I happen to live in a district where disasters are not uncommon. With Mount Saint Helens in our district, with heavy rainfall and, unfortunately, with recent landslides, we face a growing need, unfortunately, to have our citizens prepared to prevent and to respond to disasters when they do occur.

Just last week I spent dozens of hours working with a group of citizens from a neighborhood in Kelso, Washington, whose homes have been completely destroyed by a slow-moving landslide. From this experience I have learned a great deal about what happens to families and to neighborhoods when disaster strikes, and I know how imperative it is to help those folks cope with disasters once they occur. I also believe that we need to do more to focus on disaster prevention, and it is to that issue that we speak today.

In the past 10 years, FEMA has spent over \$20 billion to help rebuild communities after natural disasters, and the SBA has approved billions more in

loans during that same period of time. In 1998 alone, SBA approved over 30,000 loans valued at approximately \$728 million. As I speak to my colleagues today, the Cascade Mountains in Washington State are laden with more than two times the normal average snow pack, and if we have an unfortunate weather occurrence, the probability of flooding is quite high. So clearly any approach, such as that which we are discussing today, to minimize damages resulting from natural disasters has the potential to reduce costs to all our taxpayers and, more importantly, to save peoples' lives and homes.

For that reason, I have been strongly supportive of the Impact Program of FEMA that incorporates a simple philosophy: Invest today in long-term prevention so that we may reduce damages resulting from natural disasters. By taking modest steps in advance, we really can save money; and, more importantly, we can save lives.

The operative notion today is money spent in prevention will save all of us money in post-disaster assistance. This legislation will create a demonstration program at SBA. It will provide low-interest loans to small businesses to finance measures that might reduce property loss and increase worker safety in the event of a natural disaster. It authorizes SBA to finance up to \$15 million in new loans each year for 5 years and to award those loans to businesses who want to make the necessary changes to reduce disaster impact. This bill also contains an accountability measure. It requires the SBA administrator to report to Congress in the fourth year of the program regarding the number of loans it provided and the estimated savings to the taxpayers and the government that will result from the mitigation efforts.

Mr. Speaker, in our own lives we all try to anticipate risks and try to do what we can to prevent them. Today's effort represents a common-sense, bipartisan approach to minimizing disaster impact. It has the support of Republicans and Democrats alike because it has the potential to save taxpayers' money and to save the lives of our citizens.

So, again, I want to express my profound appreciation to the chairman and to the ranking member and encourage my colleagues in joining me today in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 818, the Disaster Mitigation Pilot Program.

Traditionally, business owners have only been able to get help after a natural disaster has struck and caused damage to their business. For many small businesses, this assistance comes too late to save them from economic ruin.

The loss of revenue and time needed to recover causes countless businesses to fail. Instead of being able to rebuild, many communities are faced with a loss of jobs as many businesses permanently close after a disaster.

We have seen this happen again and again over the past few years. Hurricanes, floods and wildfires have threatened economic stability and the future of communities across this Nation. However, until today, businesses have only been able to get help after it is too late. Today's legislation will change this story.

Mr. Speaker, today we are taking an important step in being proactive rather than just reactive to natural disasters. H.R. 818, the Disaster Mitigation Pilot Program, authorizes \$75 million to be used by SBA in cooperation with FEMA over the next 5 years to help businesses in disaster-prone areas take preventive measures to avert or minimize damage should disaster strike. By enabling businesses to take preventive measures which mitigate the damages caused by floods, hurricanes and other disasters, this program would allow them to recover much faster. Therefore, instead of going out of business, they will be able to get back to business much quicker than ever before.

The Disaster Mitigation Program is a common-sense approach to helping businesses cope with disasters. The program also makes fiscal sense. Some estimates show that every dollar spent on mitigation saves \$2 in money that will otherwise have to be spent on post-disaster response. Not only will businesses and taxpayers come out ahead, but the American economy will as well.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT). Their constituents face the threat of natural disaster, and their insight and hard work on this legislation have been a great help to all of us. I strongly support H.R. 818, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

□ 1315

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for yielding time to me.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend our hard-working chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. JIM TALENT), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ) for their leadership and creativity which is providing unprecedented support for small businesses across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and express my strong support for H.R. 818, a bill which authorizes \$15 million for the Disaster Mitigation Pilot Program of the Small Business Administration. Although there is

hardly a part of this country that has not been victimized by natural disasters, as Members know, I represent a district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, which has been devastated by over 5 major hurricanes over the past 10 years. I therefore know firsthand the importance of the Small Business Disaster Assistance Program.

As a matter of fact, the Virgin Islands has utilized \$388 million in disaster loan assistance since that time, third only to California and Florida.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass this legislation. Once H.R. 818 is enacted into law, the SBA will be joining FEMA's Project IMPACT in providing a means for businesses to mitigate the effects of hurricanes. It will be reducing the overall damage to the community that these storms can cause.

I am a resident of the island of St. Croix, which is a Project IMPACT designee, and has been cited by FEMA for its successful mitigation efforts in decreasing damage, injuries, and recovery costs to that agency. Hurricane Georges came through the Virgin Islands, but we heard very little about it because we were prepared. We are a testimony to the fact that mitigation works.

This is a program that I know will be embraced by communities across the country as they try to deal with disasters. I urge the passage of H.R. 818.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to hear how successful this program can be.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 818, the Small Business Disaster Mitigation Coordination Act. This is a \$15 million effort to help small businesses in disaster-prone areas to take preventive measures to avert and minimize damage due to natural disasters.

This bill, as we have already heard, will further assist FEMA and the SBA in reducing disaster losses by focusing the energy of these departments on the importance of helping small businesses prepare and recover from natural disasters.

By passing H.R. 818, Congress will help FEMA and the SBA provide more disaster assistance to one of the most vulnerable segments of our society, small and very small businesses.

For instance, on August 16th, 1997, severe thunderstorms released heavy amounts of rain in a short period of time. The National Weather Service reported that over 4 inches of rain fell in less than 2 hours on the West Side of Chicago and in neighboring suburban communities. As much as 6.1 inches of rain were recorded in some areas.

The rate of rainfall produced flash flooding that severely overloaded the stormwater drainage system. With nowhere else to flow, the rainwater backed up into literally thousands of

basements in the city of Chicago, destroying homes and businesses alike. This bill will enable these businesses to apply and receive loans to prepare before disasters like this one strike.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent proposal put forth by the Committee on Small Business. I think once again this committee has risen to the occasion. It saw a need, recognized a problem, and got in front of it. So I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for making sure that we as Congress do our part to prevent disasters from devastating the small businesses of our Nation.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue for California, and I am sure Members understand that California has been through floods, fire, and earthquakes in the last 5 years that have necessitated the heavy assistance from FEMA that comes in reactively.

We certainly endorse the thrust of this H.R. 818, and commend both sides for the effort they are putting into working effectively to help small businesses be able to be proactive in an area that is of vital concern to the whole Nation, not just California.

This would enable my small businesses to be able to move some of their infrastructure to where the damage, whether it is a fire or flood, will be less devastating, and in earthquakes, be able to assist a small business survive the rock and rolling that happens in an earthquake in California by being able to strap down their most important pieces of equipment, so they are not damaged.

So it is very essential for us, and I would hope that it would be a slightly larger amount than \$15 million a year for 5 years. I think California alone would be able to use that amount, but the effort is what counts. I am sure that both sides will understand, and small business will thank their representatives for being able to understand how important this piece of legislation will be.

I heartily ask both sides to consider that this bill will be a very highly proactive small business bill, because it will be small business that will benefit from it.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 818, and I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), the chairman, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), and the

gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for their efforts in this regard.

For many people nationwide, I think Guam is synonymous with a number of things. One of them is certainly natural disasters. Guam's location as the "center arrow" of the Pacific Ocean's typhoon alley has made my island community prone to disasters, sometimes on an annual basis. In this decade alone, Guam has been subjected to at least a dozen typhoons. At one time, five had hit Guam in the span of 3 months.

As many may recall, the most recent storm, Typhoon Paka, devastated the island in December of 1997 and caused property damage of over \$100 million. On top of these storms, Guam also became a victim of an 8.2 earthquake in 1994, which has been one of the strongest recorded in the Pacific in this century.

H.R. 818 is good legislation. It is proactive, and it will prepare communities, and in particular small businesses, for recovery. SBA already assists my island community by giving SBA disaster loans, and along with FEMA, SBA provides a Federal team that almost every citizen in Guam knows about. I think very few communities could state that their citizens know of what FEMA and SBA disaster loans are all about.

This legislation will help small businesses prepare for disasters, perhaps reducing expenses at the other end of disasters, help communities recover quickly, because small businesses help generate economic activity, which will cause immediate recovery.

Reacting to a storm plagues many communities with confusion. This pilot program aims to empower the business community with information and mitigation activities which will prevent serious losses.

As the previous speaker noted, \$15 million is a very small amount, and we understand that this is a pilot project. We understand, too, that the territories are full partners in this program. We certainly hope that in coming years the amounts will be expanded, and we will do everything we can to make sure this pilot project is a success.

I thank both sides for their efforts in this regard.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the statements of my colleagues clearly indicated, the need for preventative, proactive, advanced measures to prevent the damages of natural disasters is clear.

I would like to commend the chairman of this committee for his foresight, his initiative, in moving this bill forward. I would like to thank him and thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for her support as well. This is a bill that has common sense, it will save the taxpayers money, and it has bipartisan support. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will close briefly. I appreciate very much the comments from my colleagues in support of this legislation.

I want to make a couple of points in closing, Mr. Speaker. One is that we certainly are given to understand that it is the intention of the administration to implement this legislation quickly, and I would hope that is the case.

It is just a pilot program. There is no reason why it should not be more than a pilot program. It makes perfect sense, and it is going to help a lot of people. That is what it comes down to. So we hope that the administration, the executive branch, will move quickly in implementing this, and the Committee on both sides of the aisle is going to assist in any way that we can.

The second point I wanted to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is as we have all noted, we hope that this does save dollars for the Federal government, for the Federal Treasury. I am confident it will do that. But the human cost of disasters is what we really have to look at here.

On a very practical level, to the extent we can make this program a working program, it means that small business people on flood plains, small business people on coasts that are consistently battered by typhoons or hurricanes, will have the opportunity to prevent this damage from occurring. They can get glass windows replaced by plexiglass. If they are a small accounting firm in a building, they can get the building raised so that the flood does not affect them as much as it otherwise would.

Anybody, Mr. Speaker, who has talked to individuals whose lives have been devastated by natural disasters knows how important it is that we give them an opportunity to prevent that from occurring in the first place. That is what H.R. 818 does. I commend it to all the Members of the House.

I thank, once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and in particular, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for her assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 818.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on H.R. 818.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXPORT APPLE ACT

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 609) to amend the Export Apple and Pear Act to limit the applicability of the Act to apples.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 609

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SCOPE OF EXPORT APPLE AND PEAR ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—The Act of June 10, 1933 (7 U.S.C. 581 et seq.; commonly known as the Export Apple and Pear Act), is amended by adding at the end the following new section: "SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the 'Export Apple Act'."

(b) DEFINITION OF APPLES.—Section 9 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 589) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(4) The term 'apples' means fresh whole apples, whether or not the apples have been in storage."

(c) ELIMINATION OF REFERENCES TO PEARS.—Such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking "and/or pears" each place it appears in the first section and sections 5 and 6; and

(2) by striking "or pears" each place it appears in the first section and sections 2, 3, and 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Export Apple Act replaces the Export Apple and Pear Act, which was enacted on June 10, 1933. Currently, this 66-year-old legislation requires that apples and pears meet certain standards prior to export in order to ensure only high-quality U.S. fruit moves into foreign commerce.

H.R. 609 amends the 1933 act by removing pears from the language, and it will be permitting the means to increase the export of pears.

H.R. 609, which is sponsored by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) removes pears from the act, thereby allowing U.S. exporters greater flexibility in the changing international marketplace and the opportunity to increase exports by gaining a foothold in emerging markets.

The USDA has advised the committee that mandatory Federal quality

standards for pears are no longer needed to assure the high quality of exporting pears. The USDA supports enactment of H.R. 609. As world economies improve and areas of trade continue to decrease, new market opportunities for fresh pears arise. In order to provide the flexibility to meet the requirements of these new opportunities, H.R. 609 should be passed, and I would urge that my colleagues support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 609, which updates the Apple and Pear Export Act. For many years, the Apple and Pear Export Act served pear growers well by ensuring a quality product to consumers overseas. The pear industry is now seeking greater flexibility to sell its product in emerging markets around the world.

□ 1330

Recently, the sale of 200,000 cartons of pears to Russia was made possible by a January, 1997, amendment to the act that allowed for the shipment of a more competitive grade of pears to that country. Our farmers are increasingly dependent on foreign markets. It is therefore essential that regulations governing the agricultural industry be designed to help producers compete in those markets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this regulatory improvement that will give pear growers greater flexibility to market their product.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the gentleman who sponsored this bill and has done a great job in just a few weeks of getting this bill moved forward. We appreciate and commend his work.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for their support of this legislation, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 609 will help expand export markets for our Nation's pear growers. The Export Apple and Pear Act passed in 1933 required that apples and pears meet certain standards prior to export to ensure that only the top quality pears and apples were exported.

The United States Department of Agriculture has stated that, because of private contractual arrangements between buyers and sellers, increasingly those arrangements are controlling the quality of U.S. pear exports. The USDA believes that mandatory Federal quality standards, as currently established under the act, are no longer needed to assure the high quality of exported pears.

As new markets have opened up in the last decade, opportunities for sale of lower grade and less expensive pears have arisen. Because of the 1933 act, U.S. producers and exporters of pears have been unable to meet the demand for lower grade pears in other countries without receiving a waiver of the act from USDA.

The pear industry has on two occasions over the past decade petitioned and received a waiver from the USDA to sell non-U.S. Grade Number One and Fancy Grade winter pears in the emerging markets of Central and South America and Russia. The waiver for Russia allowed the industry to sell 200,000 cartons of pears to that Nation in 1997. Past experience indicates that when these markets can afford it, they will move on to purchase our higher grade fruit.

As world economies improve and barriers to trade continue to decrease, new market opportunities for fresh pears arise. This legislation will allow our pear growers to get a foothold in emerging foreign markets. In order to provide the flexibility to meet the requirements of these two opportunities without having to seek new exemptions, the fresh pear industry is seeking to be removed from the 1933 Export Apple and Pear Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as I mentioned, has the support of the USDA, pear industry and is not opposed by the apple industry. Furthermore, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that this legislation would not impose any costs on the Federal Government. H.R. 609 is sound policy that allows U.S. pear growers and exporters the flexibility to compete in emerging foreign markets.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this important legislation to our pear growers, especially those of the Northwest, and I commend and thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) of the House Committee on Agriculture for passage of this measure to the floor.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 609.

The question was taken.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NULLIFYING RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR GUARANTEED LOANS UNDER CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 882) to nullify any reservation of funds during fiscal year 1999 for guaranteed loans under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for qualified beginning farmers or ranchers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 882

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NULLIFICATION OF RESERVATION OF FUNDS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1999 FOR GUARANTEED LOANS UNDER THE CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT FOR QUALIFIED BEGINNING FARMERS OR RANCHERS.

Amounts shall be made available pursuant to section 346(b)(1)(D) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for guaranteed loans, without regard to any reservation under section 346(b)(2)(B) of such Act.

SEC. 2. QUALIFIED BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS TO BE GIVEN PRIORITY IN MAKING GUARANTEED LOANS UNDER THE CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT FROM SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

In making guaranteed loans under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act from funds made available pursuant to any Act making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, to the extent practicable, give priority to making such loans to qualified beginning farmers and ranchers (as defined in section 343(a)(11) of such Act).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the floor a bill, H.R. 882. This bill costs nothing but will provide immediate relief to the Nation's farmers and ranchers who are today experiencing a serious credit crunch brought on by natural disasters and low commodity prices.

I am pleased to be joined by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Agriculture, as well as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), and a number of other Members in introducing this measure.

Our bill is simple and straightforward. Currently, funds for guaranteed ownership loans are exhausted in

more than half of the States. Money for guaranteed operating loans with interest assistance has dried up in most of the Corn Belt States and several others as well. There is simply no money currently available for those farmers desperately needing credit assistance now.

Meanwhile, there is approximately \$470 million in loan guarantee funds sitting in the Department of Agriculture that has gone unused and will continue to go unused for another month unless Congress acts. By law, these funds are tied up until April 1, 1999, for the Beginning Farmers and Ranchers program, a worthwhile program that is nonetheless not being tapped at this time.

This bill simply releases these unused funds one month early to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the very immediate need for guaranteed loans in farm communities.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill is very important, I do want to advise my colleagues that it does nothing to eliminate or in any way diminish the tremendous need for the supplemental appropriations for agriculture requested last week by the President. This bill is only a stopgap measure to temporarily fill an immediate need that simply cannot wait for a supplemental appropriation.

In short, the demand for credit is now. As many of my colleagues know, American farmers and ranchers borrow more money every year than most of us will borrow in a lifetime, only to risk it all. Sometimes the gamble pays off, and sometimes it does not. Last year, for many of America's farmers, it did not. As a result, cash-strapped farmers who have already made their planting decisions for the coming growing season desperately require cash in-hand right now to make another go of it.

This is the immediate short-term problem our bill would address if enacted quickly.

Again, this bill does not cost the U.S. Treasury any additional money. The funds in question have already been appropriated. In addition, I want my colleagues to know that this measure enjoys the support of the administration and a broad bipartisan support in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge immediate passage of H.R. 882.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 882 and urge its passage by the House. H.R. 882 would provide available guaranteed loan funds to farmers and ranchers currently working with their local lenders to ready their finances for planting or in deciding whether to keep their livestock herds intact.

The Department of Agriculture is projecting they will run out of guaranteed operating funds nationwide by March the 15, with interest assisted operating loan funds depleted by the end

of this week. Many of my colleagues may already be receiving phone calls from constituents who are getting ready to plant and need to buy seed, but they have been told there are no USDA loan funds available so they cannot go out and buy their needed inputs.

H.R. 882 would speed up the needed release of available guaranteed loan funds that have been reserved for beginning farmers and ranchers until April 1. Since we are not certain when a supplemental spending bill may be approved by the Congress, we could face a situation where ag producers are left without the ability to purchase needed inputs.

H.R. 882 will provide a bridge to agriculture producers and lenders until we are able to provide additional credit funds and supplemental appropriations legislation. While it does help by providing needed credit that is already available on a more timely basis, it does not do away with the need for Congress to act on this front.

This is especially true since H.R. 882 only deals with the guaranteed loan programs and does not help ease the immediate need for additional emergency loan funds and the pending need for additional direct operating and ownership loan funds.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to support this modest, fiscally responsible step to help ease the financial strain facing our farmers and ranchers as well as their hometown banks and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), chairman of the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 882, which is a bill to provide some stopgap funding for some guaranteed loans for our agricultural producers.

This bill would eliminate the restrictions on about \$470 million worth of guaranteed loans under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for qualified beginning farmers and ranchers. This is a much-needed piece of legislation that would provide for stopgap funding for many States that have exhausted their available allocations of guaranteed loan funds, including my own State of Nebraska.

It is important to stress that this money that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has not been used. The beginning farmer targets would be lifted on April 1. It would not be possible for the Department to use the "fenced" \$470 million by April 1.

Of particular concern as we prepare for spring planting in the Midwest is the ability of producers to show an adequate cash flow as they meet with their lenders. This legislation would make valuable use of this money now as farmers are preparing for their spring planting.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we have producers in rural areas that are struggling with low market prices and adverse weather conditions. With current market prices, some farmers are being faced with the added difficulty of obtaining operating loans.

Freeing up the beginning farmer guaranteed loan money that has not been used will be of great benefit to our producers. Nullifying any reservation of funds will potentially benefit a producer who otherwise would not have had a loan funding available.

As the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) has indicated, I would also stress to my colleagues that there is still a need for what the President has requested in the supplemental. This legislation is not meant to replace the supplemental, but it will get our producers through perhaps the next 30, 45 days or so.

If a beginning farmer needs money, they probably have gotten it by now, as it has been available since late October. However, for those still in the USDA bureaucratic pipeline, this legislation says that beginning farmers will have priority under the supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has been doing its part to help our beleaguered producers; and this legislation is yet another effort to ensure that our farmers and ranchers will have adequate capital this spring. I urge the passage of H.R. 882.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me this time.

I want to take this opportunity this afternoon to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member, for their hard work in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor this afternoon in such a quick manner.

I am proud to be a cosponsor on this legislation, and I am glad that we are passing a bill that will help farmers through some of the most difficult times that they will face in decades.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a year now, farmers have been excluded from the robust economy that the rest of this country has enjoyed. While many citizens debate whether or not to roll over their IRAs, farmers are just trying to figure out how they can survive and put food on the table until this crisis has been turned around.

We have to take action to make sure that they survive and they have an opportunity to prosper. If we do not, consumers will want to know why the grocery store shelves are empty and food prices are so high, while farmers are left to pick up the pieces. We have to act now.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Secretary Glickman came to a farm breakfast in my district. More than 300 farmers showed up for breakfast. That is twice

the number that normally come in any given year. From the comments of what those folks said at that breakfast, they are hurting and hurting badly.

□ 1345

These loans will determine whether or not some of those farmers and their families and their neighbors can stay on the farm. I am glad we are taking action to help farmers make it through the dire straits that they now face and that we will act today.

Our small farmers are a vital part of our economic fiber in this country. They are important to the character of rural North Carolina and America, and we cannot afford for those small farmers to cease to exist.

I am proud of what we are doing this afternoon, and I want to make sure that this important program is available to farmers as they approach the critical spring planning season.

This is the first, as you have already heard, in many steps, including crop insurance reform and supplemental funding for this year as we look at the 1999 year that this Congress must take to strengthen the safety net for our farmers.

I urge unanimous passage of H.R. 882, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture and others in this Congress to make sure that we provide a safe and secure future for American farmers so the rest of us might enjoy a safe and secure future and good food.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for pointing out the fact that, while so many people in this country think the economy is doing so well, it is obvious those who say that have not been in the farm communities recently. There are some very, very difficult times ongoing there.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 882. Natural disasters and low commodity prices have forced many farmers and ranchers to seek government loans to cover operating and ownership expenses. In fact, in many states, funds available for these USDA programs have already been exhausted, creating a credit crunch at a time when these loans are absolutely necessary to cover producers expenses.

H.R. 882 will immediately make available to the Secretary of Agriculture \$450 to \$500 million in unused funds in order to guarantee loans to farmers and ranchers. These unused funds are currently set aside for the Beginning Farmers and Ranchers program but were not to be available until April 1. Because it is not anticipated that these funds will ever be used by this program it makes sense to have them available for those most in need.

This bill requires no new net government outlays and will have no effect on the federal budget. It is a common-sense reaction to the problems facing rural America today and it deserves our full support.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 882.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 882, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY GUARANTEE INITIATIVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 32) expressing the sense of the Congress that the President and the Congress should join in undertaking the Social Security Guarantee Initiative to strengthen and protect the retirement income security of all Americans through the creation of a fair and modern Social Security Program for the 21st Century, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Social Security Guarantee Initiative".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Social Security program provides benefits to 44,000,000 Americans, including more than 27,000,000 retirees, 5,000,000 people with disabilities, and 2,000,000 surviving children, and is essential to the dignity and security of the Nation's elderly, disabled, and their families;

(2) the Social Security program's progressive benefit structure is of particular importance to women, due to their (A) longer life expectancies than men, making the Social Security program's lifetime, inflation-adjusted benefits a critical income support especially for widows; (B) lower average earnings; and (C) lower pension and other retirement savings, stemming in part from their lower incomes and their spending an average of 11 years out of the paid workforce caring for families;

(3) the approaching retirement of the Baby Boom Generation will result in the Social Security program's benefit costs exceeding its tax revenues beginning in 2013;

(4) the Social Security program faces looming insolvency and instability in the next century so that by 2032 the Social Security Trust Funds will be fully depleted and the program will be able to honor less than 75 percent of benefit commitments; and

(5) prompt action is necessary to restore Americans' confidence that their retirement benefits will be protected.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

The President and the Congress should join in strengthening the Social Security program and

protecting the retirement income security of all Americans for the 21st century in a manner that—

(1) ensures equal treatment across generations to all Americans, especially minorities and other low-income workers;

(2) recognizes the unique obstacles that women face in ensuring retirement, disability, and survivor security and the essential role that the Social Security program plays in protecting financial stability for women;

(3) provides a continuous benefit safety net for workers, their survivors, their dependents, and individuals with disabilities;

(4) protects guaranteed lifetime benefits, including cost-of-living adjustments that fully index for inflation, for current and future retirees; and

(5) does not increase taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 32.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our work on Social Security is well under way. We have held numerous Social Security hearing already this year, and the President has provided us with a framework for the Congress to consider as we work towards a bipartisan solution to Social Security's problems.

In fact, we are in agreement with President Clinton on many of the major issues relating to preserving and strengthening our Social Security system; namely, one, action is necessary now to shore up Social Security's financial underpinnings; two, 62 percent of the Federal budget surplus should be set aside until Social Security is indeed saved; three, investment in markets can be a part of the long-term solution for Social Security; and, four, personal savings accounts are both technically feasible and a necessary part of the solution.

Passage of H.J. Res. 32 will add to this strong start and will further strengthen our bipartisanship as we face the challenges ahead. The joint resolution says that Congress and the President should protect benefits for current and future retirees while avoiding any tax increases.

On a program as vital to our country as Social Security, I am sure all of my colleagues will agree that we must work together, and H.J. Res. 32 is a measure that deserves all of our support. I hope they will join with me in showing the American people that Congress is committed to strengthening and preserving Social Security for the future and for future generations.

Let me also add that I view this resolution as a test of whether the two parties can work together. We certainly

did in the passage of this in the full committee. If we divide into partisanship over a simple, noncontroversial resolution affirming our support for Social Security, why should the American people expect us to be able to work together to actually save Social Security.

Whatever our differences may be, and I am sure we will have plenty of differences, surely we can agree on this resolution as it is vitally necessary to the future of Social Security that we do work together and we work together in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the old partisan days, I would say this resolution is good because Santa Clause is coming through. But recognize that we have not had too many legislative accomplishments. Being very anxious to display some degree of bipartisanship, let me congratulate the majority for this resolution for whatever it means.

In the olden days, when people saw a problem, they started legislating. But if this is a new thing, where you send a message that I recognize the problem and I do intend to legislate, well, who can be against that?

So let me join with my Republican colleagues and say we have a very, very serious problem with Social Security in its present form. The majority party is acknowledging that it is going to do something about it. They have met the President halfway in terms of identifying the set-aside of the 62 percent. But they have a great deal of difficulty in stating that they will not entertain a tax cut from using the surplus until such time as we take care of the Social Security system and the Medicare trust system as we know it.

Now, I do not know why these things are omitted. I have no idea as to why they are difficult to talk about. But let me join with my friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and say that half a loaf is better than nothing. I sincerely hope that we get beyond these resolutions and see what we can do in a bipartisan way to find a solution to this serious problem.

The reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and I know that this problem does not lend itself to a Republican answer or to a Democratic answer. If it is going to be done, and we both hope that it will be done, it has to be done in a bipartisan way.

What has been done to move us closer to a bipartisan effort besides this resolution, I do not know. But if, with a great deal of imagination, I can say that let this be that one first step toward a journey which has to be concluded this year if we are going to do anything at all, then I want to be on the floor to join with the gentleman from Florida in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. MATSUI), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the architect of this joint resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the comments that were made. We do have to get beyond resolutions and get to real solutions. But as we debate what we are going to do on Social Security, we need to send a message to our Nation's Social Security retirees, our current beneficiaries, that they will be held harmless in this debate as we move forward on Social Security.

I authored this resolution because I believe it is vital that Congress send a very clear message to the millions of Americans who rely on Social Security today.

As we debate how best to fix and preserve Social Security, we must also commit ourselves to guaranteeing this generation of retirees that their benefits will be there when they need them.

I recently completed 21 town hall meetings over the Congressional recess on Social Security throughout southern Wisconsin. At every single one of these meetings, I had constituents who are concerned about the talk they hear on Social Security. Whether it is 62 percent, 38 percent, whatever percent, they are concerned that their current level of benefits will be diminished.

I think it is very important that we, as a conference, on a bipartisan basis, send a signal that their benefits will not be cut; that we have to preserve guaranteed benefits for current retirees and people who are about to retire. Then we have to look at how we are going to keep Social Security solvent for future generations.

This is the most important task that is facing this Congress this year. I think that this resolution gets us off to a good start, gets us off to a bipartisan agreement.

From the western edge of my district in Brodhead, Wisconsin, to the shores of Lake Michigan in Racine, at every stop, I heard these types of comments. There was one thing that I learned, that I heard from an older gentleman in Evansville, Wisconsin; and this is a remarkable recommendation. I want to quote him. He said, "If Congress allows Social Security to go broke, and seniors can no longer receive their benefits, then Members of Congress should not be allowed to receive their pensions."

The people will hold this Congress and this administration accountable, and they should. Thousands of other

seniors throughout my district have echoed these concerns. They have great concerns about whether Social Security will be there as we negotiate and as we put together a bipartisan agreement to fix this program for the seniors in the future.

But I want to be very clear about what this resolution does. One, for current and soon-to-be retirees, there will be no loss of benefits, no additional costs to beneficiaries, and no increased payroll taxes. Two, for the next generation of retirees who are now paying into the Social Security program, we must guarantee that the program will be saved and that their benefits will be there in their retirement years.

Mr. Speaker, we have a historic opportunity to preserve what has been one of our Nation's most successful programs. I look forward to working with both seniors in my district and my colleagues in Congress on this important issue.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is the most successful domestic program in the history of our Nation, keeping 40 percent of our elderly out of poverty and 800,000 children out of poverty.

I support this resolution. But the real issue is whether Congress will finish the work begun by the President when he introduced the framework for Social Security, strengthening our system. The President's plan lays out a good foundation of reducing public debt and shoring up the program's assets.

Social Security is too important of a program to play partisan politics. We must focus on improving the Trust Fund rate of return, restoring long-term solvency, and protecting benefits for current and future retirees. We should also focus on helping Americans save for their retirement to supplement the guaranteed benefit they receive from Social Security.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should make strengthening Social Security and Medicare our top fight and enact those reforms before any other aspect of our budget. Let us make it our top priority. Let us get it done. Let us get it done in a bipartisan way, and let us move on, really, to the bill itself rather than just this resolution.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of House Joint Resolution 32. I want to thank my fellow freshman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for his leadership on this issue.

This bill is our opportunity to stand up and say our government will pay what it owes the people. We are committed to keeping the promise of Social Security.

When our constituents look at their pay stubs, they see a large portion of their hard-earned money going to Social Security. Ninety-six percent of all workers pay 12.4 percent of payroll taxes. That is 148 million workers and their employers.

□ 1400

Every one of those workers sees the exact dollar amount on the Social Security portion of their paychecks. In exchange for that money, they expect a certain amount of help in their retirement years. They expect that money to come back to them in later years. I repeat, they expect that money to come back to them in later years. They do not care about charts and graphs here in Washington, they just know that money is going out of their pockets and expect to have some of it come back. They have paid for Social Security, they have been promised the money will come back to them when they retire, and we are committed to making sure that promise is kept.

I know that some changes, some of them possibly difficult changes, will have to be made to make Social Security solvent, but we need to keep our promise.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution recognizes the historic importance of Social Security and commits the Congress to protect guaranteed lifetime benefits, including cost-of-living adjustments that fully index for inflation, for current and future retirees. For this reason, I will vote for it, but I must note several flaws in the resolution.

We should have included a provision that states that Social Security should be strengthened in a way that does not cut benefits, does not raise the retirement age, and does not place individuals at financial risk in their senior years by diverting Social Security tax revenues to individual private accounts. These ought to be the guiding principles of the Social Security debate.

This resolution also states as fact the prediction of the trustees that by 2032 the trust funds will be fully depleted and the program will be able to honor less than 75 percent of benefit commitments. But this prediction will be correct only if the trustees' other prediction, that our economic growth rate will decline from 3.8 percent to 1.5 percent, and stay at that absurdly low level for 70 years, is also correct.

All of the budget calculations of the administration, the House Committee on the Budget, the Senate Committee on the Budget, and CBO assume much higher growth rates. Nobody really believes that the 1.5 percent prediction of the trustees is anywhere near correct. So we should not make a congressional

finding of fact we do not really believe to be true.

But even granting the trustees' projection for the sake of argument, the shortfall predicted by the trustees is still small and manageable, can be completely funded in a way that does not cut benefits, raise the retirement age, raise tax rates or shift economic risk to individuals by shifting to a system of individual accounts.

I plan on introducing legislation later this week that will do just that.

Raising the retirement age, which is a key component of many so-called "reform" proposals, is cruel and unnecessary, especially for those whose careers demand hard physical labor, and this resolution ought to say so.

Cutting benefits, either directly or by replacing the defined benefit nature of Social Security with a defined contribution program, would devastate millions of Americans who are just barely getting by right now. Benefits should not be reduced and the basic guarantee of Social Security must not be undermined in any way. This is crucial, and it ought to be included in this resolution.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who has early on been working very hard on a reform package.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his good words.

This resolution is good. All resolutions are good that move us ahead with a commitment to fix this significant problem. I think maybe we will start believing these resolutions and we will do it.

But, look, everybody needs to understand it is not easy. A Committee on the Budget staffer just figured out if we put every cent of the surplus into Social Security at a nominal return of 10.5 percent, every cent of the surplus over the next 5 years, it would only keep Social Security solvent until the year 2040.

I mean this is a tough question. It is so easy to demagogue. I hope there will be a commitment by both sides of the aisle and the President of the United States to not criticize parts of the program as we try to move ahead with a very serious effort to make a solution. I would ask the Democrats to give us their ideas and their proposals that can be scored to keep Social Security solvent and, likewise, Republicans do the same, to try to seriously move ahead with saving a very important program.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I wish to use this opportunity for a little prekindergarten 101 budget talk.

Through all the rhetoric we hear today and we are soon to hear as we anxiously await the budget for 2000, let us remind ourselves today there is no surplus to be divided for any purpose for the next 2 years, other than by

using Social Security Trust Fund. And for the next 5 years there is \$82 billion that are non-Security Trust Fund.

Let us remind ourselves of that and use this opportunity in a bipartisan way, as we unanimously vote for this resolution today, that what we are saying is, unequivocally, that a lot of the rhetoric we hear about who and how much we are going to spend, and how much we are going to cut taxes, will not fit within the spirit of the resolution that is voted on today.

Let us remind ourselves of that today as we vote for this and use this in a positive way to do what all of us want to do, both sides of the aisle. And I agree with the gentleman from Michigan, there are some of us on this side, as on that side, that are willing to make some of the tough choices. That will come through committee work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. This resolution doesn't do anything to actually strengthen Social Security, but I hope that it is the beginning of a bipartisan process to honestly address the financial problems facing Social Security.

Social Security reform should start by walling off the Social Security surplus and saving it for Social Security. We shouldn't even talk about budget surpluses until we have truly taken Social Security off-budget by balancing the budget without counting the Social Security surplus. All of the Social Security surplus should be saved for Social Security by using them to reduce the debt held by the public.

There is no surplus today unless you count the Social Security surplus. A tax cut that is not paid for will require us to increase borrowing from Social Security trust fund for purposes other than saving it for Social Security.

I want to remind all of my colleagues that there is no free lunch. The promised benefits under Social Security will cost \$9 trillion more than we can afford over the next 75 years—that money will have to come from somewhere. The Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and the General Accounting Office and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan have all testified that Congress and the President must make tough choices to bring Social Security costs in line with revenues. Many proposals that appear on the surface to offer painless resolutions have significant hidden costs and shortcomings which must be taken into consideration.

I have been critical of the President's plan for avoiding the heavy lifting of proposing reforms to deal with the unfunded liabilities of the system. I am equally troubled by the proposals being floated by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle that suggest that individual accounts are a magic bullet that offers a painless solution to save Social Security without making any structural reforms.

Rhetorically acknowledging that tough choices are inevitable is not enough. Reaching agreement on fiscally responsible legislation that truly makes Social Security financially sound without simply shifting costs to future taxpayers will require leadership by the President and Congressional leadership. I encourage both the President and the Leadership hear in Congress to provide the leadership necessary to move the debate beyond the misleading suggestion that projected surpluses

alone will save Social Security and begin a serious discussion about the tough choices that remain.

There is a bipartisan bill that meets all of the principles in this resolution which makes Social Security financially sound and gives future generations the flexibility to address other priorities. JIM KOLBE and I have proposed legislation, the 21st Century Retirement Security Plan, which would preserve the best features of the current system while modernizing it for the 21st century. Our plan would strengthen the safety net, restore the long-term solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund, reduces future liabilities and increase individual control over retirement income, all without increasing taxes.

The plan would create individual security accounts, funded through a portion of the current payroll tax, to explicitly replace unfunded liabilities by prefunding a portion of future retirement income. The plan also establishes a minimum benefit provision which, for the first time, guarantees that workers who work all their life and play by the rules will be protected from poverty, regardless of what happens to their individual accounts. We make benefit changes in a progressive manner through bend point changes that affect middle and upper income workers, who will benefit from individual accounts. Perhaps most importantly, our legislation ensures that future governments will have resources to deal with other problems in addition to providing Social Security by honestly confronting the future unfunded liabilities of the system that will threaten other budgetary priorities if we do not take action.

I encourage all my colleagues to follow through on the bipartisan rhetoric embodied in this resolution and roll up our sleeves to tackle the tough choices necessary to strengthen and preserve Social Security for the 21st Century.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), a member of the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a daunting challenge at hand, and part of that challenge of saving Social Security is to approach this problem not as Republicans or as Democrats, but as Americans; understanding the dependence of many in their old age on this program, understanding the concerns of those of generations just entering the work force, understanding the concerns of baby boomers who have paid into the system and hope to see it continue.

As we begin this debate, as we work to solve this problem, this resolution is a good starting point. In committee we accepted many amendments from our friends in the minority. Now, there is not unanimity, to be sure, but with this resolution we reaffirm the primacy, necessity and commitment of this Congress to the Social Security program. And, more importantly, we say, let us save it without increasing taxes and protecting against inflation. So that is where we start.

I would echo the comments of my colleague from Michigan; that we

should avoid the temptation to point fingers, to engage in fear rather than facts. And the reality must be borne out by our rhetoric and, more importantly, our resolve. The American people look to us and count on us, and in this spirit today it begins now with the passage of this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I basically support this resolution. Americans have been misled by some to doubt that Social Security will provide retirement security. In fact, Social Security does not face a financial crisis. A projected shortfall occurring 34 years in the future is not a crisis, it is a projection. No other organization, public or private, has a plan for operation nearly two generations into the future.

Social Security does face a political crisis if Congress abandons its commitments to guarantee benefits. This resolution is a good first move and should put to rest whether Social Security will pay full benefits. With this resolution Congress pledges to guarantee paying full benefits to current and future retirees.

A pledge is good. Making it the law would be better. Congress will have to add this concept in any reform legislation we adopt to make the words of this resolution meaningful. We must work to ensure that any reform legislation Congress passes also upholds the Social Security guarantee that promised benefits are as good as money and are backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, just like our currency and bonds.

I hope everyone will join me in adding meaning to this resolution by writing the Social Security guarantee into law.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts of my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for his introduction of a resolution that undertakes the Social Security Guarantee Initiative. Through this resolution we establish a framework for debate and reaffirm our commitment to the long-term solvency of Social Security.

It is clear to me that the moment is prime for a national debate on Social Security. The citizens of our Nation understand the importance of Social Security's fiscal health, not only for the time being but for generations yet to come. They expect their elected officials to come together in a bipartisan fashion to provide solutions.

I recently had the opportunity to lead a forum on the future of Social Security reform. What struck me the most about this particular event was that its main participants were not a panel of experts or a group of politicians. Instead, those most interested were concerned North Carolinians who have a stake in the system and expect a fair return on their investment. They

do not need policy experts from Washington to explain to them that in a few years the government will not have enough money to keep the promises it made when the program began.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring the viability of Social Security is a tall challenge, and I realize there is no silver bullet, but we must take one step at a time. I support the resolution before us now and the spirit of cooperation that it represents. Citizens from my district, the Eighth District of North Carolina, expect their elected officials, Republicans and Democrats alike, to work together for a better future.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

The resolution calls for equal treatment in Social Security across generations, especially for workers of minorities. It says Congress must recognize the unique obstacles facing women and the disabled. The resolution says we must guarantee a lifetime benefit for America's elderly and those future retirees and avoid, in the process, increasing taxes.

Now, I support these principles, and I believe the President's framework also advances these principles in the administration's proposal for dealing with Social Security. I am, therefore, going to vote for this resolution. But I want to note the resolution, in and of itself, does nothing.

A point of concern I would have about it is that sometimes I have seen resolutions offered by majorities that have no intention on actually advancing legislation to get something done. I have also seen resolutions extolling principles advanced when the plan is to advance legislation that actually achieves something quite different.

Now, the ultimate question, and the point of uncertainty, can only be addressed by a plan. So I say to the majority, give us a plan. Let us move the debate past meaningless resolutions to actual debate.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution because it involves the most important of all issues, preserving Social Security and Medicare. But while I appreciate the sentiments, I think it is most important we really get down to legislation.

In a sense, this is a baby step when we need a great leap forward. It is entitled Social Security Guarantee Initiative, but it really guarantees nothing. We have to get busy on legislation. The President has proposed his position, now we need to hear from the majority and then begin to compare notes and to act.

This resolution would be more meaningful if it had said that the first priority should be to save Social Security

and Medicare as we proposed in the full committee. But in any event, let us pass this resolution and then get down to a bipartisan effort to secure Social Security and Medicare for the long run.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of this resolution, and I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for the statements they have made publicly to work together in a bipartisan way.

One statement we will make very clear today is every Member of the House, I expect, will vote for this. Because even though we may disagree a little bit on how to do it, we all stand here because we want to save Social Security. In fact, we are committed to saving Social Security not just for today's seniors but for future generations, the next three generations, who depend on Social Security.

When I think of Social Security, I think of my own mom and dad, now in their 70s. I think of my nieces and nephews that are college age and entering the work force out of high school. They all look for Social Security. They have paid their dues into Social Security, and they want Social Security to be there when it is their turn.

Social Security today, as some have pointed out, is sound for today's seniors. But the question is how are we going to make Social Security sound for future generations. That is the challenge that is before us.

I hope we remember as we go through this process the importance of looking at how Social Security impacts women as we look at the numbers; as we look at ways to ensure that we treat women equally and fairly when it comes to Social Security. Because it is clear that statistics show that elderly women have been almost twice as likely as elderly men to live in poverty. That is a challenge we need to meet, and I hope we can do it in a bipartisan way.

Once again, I also plan to offer an additional solution to help supplement Social Security. I believe that we should reward retirement savings. I believe that we should eliminate discrimination against retirement savings and allow people to contribute more to their 401(k)s and their IRAs.

□ 1415

We should also allow working moms to make up missed contributions through catch-up IRAs, allow them to make up the contributions for their retirement accounts that they could have made had they stayed working and instead chose to stay home with their children.

We should allow working moms to have that opportunity. Catch-up IRAs will be a big help for women. Let us work in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Social Security Subcommittee, I strongly support H.R. Res. 32. This resolution expresses the willingness of Congress to work with the President to strengthen and protect the Social Security system for current and future generations. Just last week, this resolution passed the Ways and Means Committee with a unanimous, bipartisan vote of 32-0.

Social Security affects the majority of Americans, whether it be a 70 year old retiree, a 40 year old parent, or a 19 year old college student. We all pay our Social Security taxes with the promise that when we retire, we will collect the benefits that are due to us. Unfortunately, our Social Security system is in dire straits and it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to make sure that the program remains healthy and stable far into the 21st century.

As we discuss ways to change the system, we must also remember that women, even more than men, rely on the Social Security system for financial security in their golden years. Over their lifetime, because of family commitments, many women cannot accumulate adequate pension savings. By the mid-1990s, only 18 percent of women over the age of 64 received their own pension benefits and their pension benefits were less than half of those received by men.

Additionally, we must keep certain important statistics in mind. In 1997, elderly women were almost twice as likely as elderly men to live in poverty. Additionally, the poverty rate for unmarried elderly women was 19 percent in 1997. This is a crucial statistic because 60 percent of elderly women are unmarried. Also significant, nearly 30 percent of elderly black and Hispanic women lived in poverty in 1997, making Social Security especially important to minority, elderly women.

To help women save for their later years, I plan to again offer legislation to help improve retirement savings opportunities for women and other individuals who opted out of the workforce to raise families. These Catch-up IRAs will also allow individuals approaching retirement the ability to save more for their golden years, and for all savers the ability to make additional "after tax" contributions to their savings plans.

I am encouraged by H.J. Res. 32 and I hope that President Clinton will join us in finding bipartisan solutions to the problems that plague our Social Security System. Additionally, I hope that we can continue to work together to find Social Security reform solutions which protect the special needs of women in their retirement years.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on H.J. Res. 32 in the Committee on Ways and Means was not a debate about whether we should save Social Security or give the American people a tax cut. Both the Democrats and Republicans favor tax cuts so long as they are paid for. The debate was about whether we would memorialize our commitment and then keep our promise to the American people not to touch a dime of the surplus until we have saved Social

Security for future generations. This resolution does not make that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security system is the most respected and successful system in U.S. history. While my remarks will not change the resolution, I want to let the American people know that I, along with my Democratic colleagues, are serious about addressing the long-term solvency problems facing the Social Security system and stand by our commitment to save Social Security first.

We owe it to the over two-thirds of older Americans who rely on Social Security for 50 percent or more of their total income. We owe it to the hard-working American families who rely on Social Security for continued prosperity as they enter into retirement. And, most of all, we owe it to our children who deserve to know that Social Security is going to be there for them.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution of my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN). Today, this Chamber takes an important step towards strengthening our Nation's Social Security system. However, this goal can only be achieved if we work together to find a permanent solution to the problems facing this important program.

The American people deserve more than Washington simply placing a Band-Aid on the problem by offering a temporary solution. This would not be leadership. It would be politics as usual. In order to assure retirement income security for all Americans, both sides of the aisle will have to work together, not against one another.

Ronald Reagan once said, there is no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he does not mind who gets the credit.

As we debate Social Security reform, it must not be about who gets the credit but how can we shore up the system, provide equal treatment, protect benefits and avoid tax increases for our fellow Americans.

Citizens of the Sixth District of Kentucky and across America want genuine leadership. Let us give them just that and let us support this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I want to thank the committee for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution, but let us understand that this resolution is only the beginning. It pledges all of us to save Social Security. That pledge will also have to include a decision not to invade those Social Security trust funds.

This week, on the cover of Barron's Magazine, they have the headline which screams to people in Washington, D.C. This week, the Dow Jones financial magazine says there is no budget surplus. And they are quite correct; there is no budget surplus. There is only money that is in excess in the Social Security trust fund, and whether or not we save Social Security will depend upon the decisions we make in this Congress about whether we are going to break the budget caps that restrain spending in this Congress; whether or not we are going to invade these trust funds for a whole range of spending proposals that are currently before the Congress.

If we do that this year and if we do that before 2001, every dollar we spend will come out of the Social Security trust funds. Because Barron's has it right. There is no other surplus. There is only the Social Security trust funds.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard today and just heard from the previous speaker, both in terms of politics and substance, reforming Social Security and making the needed changes to preserve the system over time is going to be very, very difficult. It is going to require bipartisanship; it is going to require trust; and it is going to require small steps, many small steps, to get us there.

That is what I see this resolution being all about, it is a small step in the right direction. It is not a solution. It is not the plan to save Social Security. But it does lay out for the first time in this Congress principles, basic principles, that I hope we can agree on, on a bipartisan basis. That seems to me to be a very good starting point.

I would say also that there is a need to supplement Social Security with more private retirement savings, and I hope that we can work on a bipartisan basis on that as well. This is our 401(k) plans, our IRA plans and so on. Because, ultimately, that is an important part of retirement security for all Americans.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot get this done and get it done this year, so long as we reach out across the aisle and work on a bipartisan basis. And I see us beginning to do that with this resolution today; and, therefore, I strongly support it.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that here in Washington a promise is never really a guarantee. And so the resolution that we have before us today has been self-styled by the Republican leadership as the "Social Security Guarantee Initiative." But it is important for every American to understand that there is no guaran-

tee in the Guarantee Initiative. It guarantees absolutely nothing in the way of any substantive improvement in the Social Security system.

I believe it was not a Democrat but a Republican member of the committee that studied this measure, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who conceded that this resolution, H.J. Res. 32, is solely, in his words, and I quote, "a political document. It has no teeth." No teeth, indeed. I would suggest that this resolution offers less promise than an ill-fitting set of dentures.

On day one of this Congress, we Democrats proposed a rule to save Social Security first, to see that the surplus was not dissipated, that we utilized it to preserve the future of the Social Security system. That was rejected on day one of this Congress; and, since that time, now entering month three of this Congress, not much progress, a few hearings but not much progress, has been made towards strengthening and preserving Social Security.

Instead of meaningful action, as Americans will remember in 1995 our Republican colleagues said they wanted a revolution. We have now come another 4 years, and they present us a resolution. I believe what we really need is a bipartisan solution to preserve and protect and strengthen the Social Security system.

What might that bipartisan solution, not a meaningless resolution like we are considering today, what might it include and what might it exclude? We have an excellent idea of that today in a new report.

One of the groups that has been working toward a solution of this problem is the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. They turned to a Republican economist, who did a simulation, looking at various proposals to reject the Social Security system as we have known it for the last many decades and substitute for it some type of private system. This study is entitled "Winners and Losers from 'Privatizing' Social Security."

What this study concluded was that there are many losers and not very many winners. In fact, the conclusion of the study is that, with these various schemes to reject our current Social Security system, instead of to strengthen and preserve it, that every person alive today, in these United States or anywhere else, who is drawing Social Security or could draw Social Security in the future, every person will lose under the various schemes to privatize fully or partially the Social Security system instead of to strengthen and preserve it.

The only people who might stand to gain, we were told in this simulation, which fortunately is just that, a simulation instead of an experiment on the American people as some have advanced, but the only people who would gain are a few high-income males to be

born somewhere 20 or 30 years from now after the full transition costs to a private system are effected.

So with that kind of information now available, it is time to reject ideology and focus on real, meaningful changes in this system that will strengthen and preserve it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an important study with important findings. There has been so much held out about how if we had a revolution in Social Security and we rejected the system as we have known it for the last many decades, that everybody would be the winner. But when one looks at the facts, the winners just are not there.

Everyone loses if we reject this system and substitute the kind of revolutionary system that some of these Washington think-tank ideologues have been advancing. So I hope we will come together behind some of the proposals the President has advanced to strengthen and preserve Social Security in a truly bipartisan manner.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just comment on the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) with respect to what the Subcommittee on Social Security has been doing and what the full Committee on Ways and Means has been doing since the beginning of this Congress.

We have already had more hearings on Social Security than we did on welfare reform, and that is just from the beginning of this year, than we had in drafting the welfare reform bill.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a valuable member of the Subcommittee on Social Security, knows this well. He has attended these hearings, and he has been very attentive in these hearings, so I would not want anyone listening to this proceeding to in any way think that Congress has been sitting on its hands. It has not. There will be proposals out there, and these proposals will be in the form of draft legislation.

I would hope and I intend to, as the subcommittee chairman, to be part of a majority bill that will be put in place and hopefully will become the framework for moving forward on a bipartisan solution.

I would also invite the minority to put forth their bill. I would also invite the President to put forth his bill. They will be received with great courtesy and cooperation, and I would pledge hearings on any such bills that would come before my subcommittee that have the backing of the minority party or the White House.

I believe this is very important. That is how strongly I feel about a bipartisan solution and a bipartisan effort. The Committee on Ways and Means is working very, very hard. The system is in crisis and we do need to find a solution, because we can avoid this crisis very early and be sure that the Social Security system is in place and continues to be a very safe system for all

Americans, both of this generation and generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

First of all, the gentleman is correct. We have had four full committee hearings and we have had three, I believe, subcommittee hearings. But I have to say, and I think most people would confirm my comments, and I have sat through almost all of the hearings except maybe 3 hours of the 20 hours of hearings, and most of the purposes of these hearings and most of the people talking at these hearings have been basically just trashing the President's proposal.

The Republicans asked that the President come up with his proposal last year. The President has come up with an outline that everyone understands. There is no complexity to it. We have just been spending all our time just trashing the President. We have spent very little time on real substance.

And I think what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) was referring to is a comprehensive study that actually was done by John Mueller. John Mueller, for those who were here in the 1980s, was the economist for the Republican Conference under the leadership of then Jack Kemp; and Mr. Mueller came in with the idea of doing this study with a bias actually toward private accounts.

What basically happened is that he completed the study and now he believes that private accounts would really do bad damage. This was commissioned, by the way, by Martha McSteen, who happened to be the administrator for the Social Security Administration in 1983 to 1986, under the leadership of Ronald Reagan.

So we had two Reagan people, one Reagan and one Jack Kemp, and they basically have said private accounts are the wrong way to go. It is easy to figure out why. There is \$8 trillion of unfunded liability, \$8 trillion of unfunded liability. If we go with private accounts, we have those people living today in the workforce and paying for the retirement of their parents or grandparents.

□ 1430

That means they are going to be paying twice the amount for half the benefit. That is the real problem with private accounts. You can talk about private accounts all you want, but the real person that is going to benefit from private accounts will be born 25 years from now in the year 2025, and he will be a single male. Every other economic group will lose. The biggest losers, believe it or not, are going to be women. Because women live longer than men, they are going to have to set up an annuity, they will get less even

though they may have made the same amount in the workforce.

In addition, we all know that women make about 70 percent of what men make normally in the workforce. So they are going to start off way behind, anyway. This is going to do damage to Democratic women, Republican women, conservative women and liberal women.

This is not an issue of ideology. It is a question of getting the facts and making sure we know the facts before we move. I am afraid all those hearings and everything we have been doing over the last 2 months have been basically to create a partisan division against the President's plan rather than to do anything really substantive and trying to understand this issue. But I do appreciate what the gentleman has done. He has come up with this resolution. I think, as the previous speaker said, resolutions really do not mean much. On the other hand, I guess we might as well do something since we are not doing much else. We are going to be out at 3 o'clock today so we might as well use some of that time at least pretending like we are doing something significant, but we all know that this resolution will not advance the cause of reforming the Social Security system one second.

As a result of that, we will pass it with a unanimous vote, but let us not kid ourselves. We have got to come up with a proposal. The President has. I like the President's proposal. Let us hear from the Republicans and let us see how they deal with an \$8 trillion transition cost if they want to go to private accounts and protect women and minorities and middle-income people and suburban people at the same time. You will not be able to do it. I hope you try but you will not be able to do it. Instead what we should be doing is picking up the President's plan, moving forward with it and at least solving this problem for the next 55 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to respond to the gentleman from California with regard to the remarks that he has made. We have heard the minority trash a proposal which has been characterized as a Republican proposal which has not been made as yet. There is no Republican proposal out there. We have had hearings, we have had statements with regard to the direction we should go, but there has not been a concrete proposal laid upon the table.

By contrast, I think it is interesting to note that on this side not one single speaker has gotten up and trashed the President's proposal. The President's proposal is out there. I am treating it with great courtesy. I want to encourage the President and his staff and the Treasury Department and all those connected with the Social Security

system to come forward with a concrete proposal in writing that we can receive. So I am hopeful yet that we do receive a formal proposal from the President.

The purpose of this resolution is to bring us together, to show that there is some unity in this House between Democrats and Republicans. I am not going to spoil the day by going out and trying to retaliate and bring about argument or try to accent what separates us, because this resolution is what brings us together.

Both sides have said that we are going to preserve the Social Security system. Both sides have said that we are not going to raise payroll taxes. Both sides have said that we are not going to cut benefits. When you have that as a perimeter, there is not too many other places you can go except to look at the investment of the system itself. That is where we are going to concentrate. That is where we are going to have to move forward.

This resolution is a good step forward, albeit a single step forward, but it is a good step forward in trying to show that there is unity in this House, that we do have unity of purpose and that we are going to draw together.

I will be actually out there soliciting help from the minority side in trying to craft this legislation to see that we can come up with something that is quite meaningful. This task is far too important than to bicker in a partisan manner. This is the most important item to come before this Congress either this year or next year. It would be a terrible tragedy if we were to back away from this point of history. We have a surplus. We have divided government. Both of those are very important. Because we need the divided government to be sure it is bipartisan, and we need the surplus to be sure that we save Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the resolution.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.J. Res. 32, which expresses Congress' desire to strengthen and protect Social Security. Saving Social Security must be our top priority as we prepare America for the next century.

Without fundamental changes in the Social Security program, either massive tax increases or a reduction in benefits will be required or the program will reach financial crisis by 2013. This is of special concern for most women, who have a vital interest in Social Security. The fact is, on average, women live longer than men, earn less, and are more likely to be dependent on Social Security for most or all of their retirement income.

Mr. Speaker, having paid into Social Security myself for over forty years, I will never support hasty reforms that threaten the financial futures of those who have committed a lifetime of earnings to the system. As a father and a grandfather, I will insist that our reforms provide more choices for those now entering the workforce. It is time we take action to ensure this program will be available to our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 32 to ensure a stable future for Social Security.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 32, the "Social Security Guarantee Initiative." As we all know, one of the most important questions facing Congress today is how best to preserve Social Security and Medicare for this and future generations. We need to ensure that benefits are not cut for today's Social Security recipients, while at the same time guaranteeing that our children and grandchildren will have the piece of mind that Social Security brings.

Before Social Security was enacted in 1935, retirement meant financial insecurity and poverty for many seniors. This program, however, has dramatically changed that and has allowed millions of Americans to enjoy their later years with greater tranquility and less worry. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt said it best when, upon signing the Social Security Act, he stated that "[t]he Social Security Act was primarily designed to provide the average worker with some assurance that when cycles of unemployment come or when his work days are over, he will have enough money to live decently."

It is imperative that Congress and the President work together in a bipartisan manner to achieve this goal. Arguably the most successful domestic government program in world history, it is our duty to do everything in our power to ensure its existence for years to come. I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution. And even more importantly, I urge my colleagues to put partisan differences aside, and to take concrete actions beyond this resolution, to strengthen the Social Security system.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation that focuses on the need to restore our Social Security program in a fair manner for all Americans.

With the looming prospect that its funds will be depleted by 2032, the issue of ensuring the solvency of Social Security needs to be addressed. But there are a number of priorities we must keep in mind as the debate on reforming Social Security begins to take form.

First, it is important that any reform to Social Security guarantees equal benefits to all Americans, including women and minorities.

We also need to ensure that cost-of-living adjustments and a continuous benefit safety net are provided for all Social Security recipients.

Most importantly, we want to do all we can to save Social Security without raising taxes. Americans are already over-burdened by high taxes, and it is our duty to ensure that more of their money stays in their pockets. We owe it to the American people to provide them with a fair plan that saves Social Security for generations to come without increasing their tax burden.

I am proud to support this initiative and want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for introducing this important piece of legislation.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 32, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8(c) of rule XX, this 15-minute vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on H.R. 609.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 1, not voting, 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Crane	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Crowley	Hayes
Allen	Cubin	Hayworth
Andrews	Cummings	Hefley
Archer	Cunningham	Herger
Armey	Danner	Hill (IN)
Bachus	Davis (FL)	Hill (MT)
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hilleary
Baker	Davis (VA)	Hinchey
Baldacci	Deal	Hinojosa
Baldwin	DeFazio	Hobson
Ballenger	DeGette	Hoefel
Barcia	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Barr	DeLauro	Holden
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Holt
Barrett (WI)	DeMint	Hooley
Bartlett	Deutsch	Horn
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Bass	Dickey	Houghton
Bateman	Dicks	Hoyer
Becerra	Dingell	Hulshof
Bentsen	Dixon	Hutchinson
Bereuter	Doggett	Hyde
Berkley	Dooley	Inslee
Berry	Doolittle	Isakson
Biggert	Doyle	Istook
Bilirakis	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Bishop	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Blagojevich	Edwards	(TX)
Bliley	Ehlers	Jefferson
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Jenkins
Blunt	Emerson	John
Boehlert	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	English	Johnson, E. B.
Bonilla	Eshoo	Johnson, Sam
Bonior	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Bono	Ewing	Jones (OH)
Borski	Farr	Kanjorski
Boswell	Fattah	Kaptur
Boucher	Filner	Kasich
Boyd	Fletcher	Kelly
Brady (PA)	Foley	Kennedy
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kildee
Brown (CA)	Ford	Kilpatrick
Brown (FL)	Fossella	Kind (WI)
Brown (OH)	Fowler	King (NY)
Bryant	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Burr	Franks (NJ)	Klecza
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Klink
Calvert	Frost	Knollenberg
Camp	Gallegly	Kolbe
Campbell	Ganske	Kucinich
Canady	Gejdenson	Kuykendall
Capuano	Gekas	LaFalce
Cardin	Gephardt	LaHood
Carson	Gibbons	Lampson
Castle	Gilchrest	Lantos
Chabot	Gillmor	Largent
Chambliss	Gilman	Larson
Chenoweth	Gonzalez	Latham
Clay	Goode	LaTourette
Clayton	Goodlatte	Lazio
Clement	Goodling	Leach
Clyburn	Gordon	Lee
Coble	Goss	Levin
Coburn	Graham	Lewis (CA)
Collins	Green (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Combest	Green (WI)	Lewis (KY)
Condit	Greenwood	Linder
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lipinski
Cook	Gutknecht	LoBiondo
Costello	Hall (OH)	Lofgren
Cox	Hall (TX)	Lowey
Coyne	Hastert	Lucas (KY)

Lucas (OK)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (WA)
Luther	Petri	Snyder
Maloney (CT)	Phelps	Souder
Maloney (NY)	Pickering	Spence
Manzullo	Pickett	Spratt
Markey	Pitts	Stabenow
Martinez	Pombo	Stark
Mascara	Pomeroy	Stearns
Matsui	Porter	Stenholm
McCarthy (MO)	Portman	Talent
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Tancred
McCrery	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
McDermott	Quinn	Tauscher
McGovern	Radanovich	Tauzin
McHugh	Rahall	Taylor (MS)
McInnis	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
McIntosh	Rangel	Terry
McIntyre	Regula	Thomas
McKeon	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
McKinney	Reynolds	Thornberry
McNulty	Riley	Thune
Meehan	Rivers	Thurman
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Tiahrt
Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Tierney
Menendez	Rogan	Toomey
Metcalfe	Rohrabacher	Towns
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Traficant
Millender-McDonald	Rothman	Turner
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Udall (CO)
Miller, Gary	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Miller, George	Royce	Upton
Minge	Rush	Velazquez
Mink	Ryan (WI)	Vento
Moakley	Ryun (KS)	Visclosky
Mollohan	Sabo	Walden
Moore	Salmon	Walsh
Moran (KS)	Sanchez	Wamp
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Waters
Morella	Sandlin	Watkins
Murtha	Sanford	Watt (NC)
Myrick	Sawyer	Watts (OK)
Nadler	Saxton	Waxman
Napolitano	Scarborough	Weiner
Neal	Schaffer	Weldon (FL)
Nethercutt	Schakowsky	Weldon (PA)
Ney	Scott	Weller
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Wexler
Norwood	Serrano	Weygand
Nussle	Sessions	Whitfield
Oberstar	Shadegg	Wicker
Obey	Shaw	Wilson
Olver	Shays	Wise
Ortiz	Sherman	Wolf
Ose	Sherwood	Woolsey
Owens	Shimkus	Wu
Oxley	Shows	Wynn
Packard	Shuster	Young (AK)
Pallone	Simpson	Young (FL)
Pascarella	Siskis	
Pastor	Skeen	
Payne	Skelton	
Pease	Slaughter	
Pelosi	Smith (MI)	
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	
	Smith (TX)	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—17

Berman	Cooksey	Hilliard
Bilbray	Dunn	Hunter
Buyer	Evans	McCollum
Callahan	Everett	Rogers
Cannon	Granger	Thompson (CA)
Capps	Hansen	

□ 1455

So the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President and the Congress should join in undertaking the Social Security Guarantee Initiative to strengthen the Social Security program and protect the retirement income security of all Americans for the 21st century."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

EXPORT APPLE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 609.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONDIT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 609, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Chenoweth	Fossella
Ackerman	Clay	Fowler
Aderholt	Clayton	Frank (MA)
Allen	Clement	Franks (NJ)
Andrews	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Archer	Coble	Frost
Armey	Coburn	Galleghy
Bachus	Collins	Ganske
Baird	Combust	Gejdenson
Baker	Condit	Gekas
Baldacci	Conyers	Gephardt
Baldwin	Cook	Gibbons
Ballenger	Cooksey	Gilchrest
Barcia	Costello	Gillmor
Barr	Cox	Gilman
Barrett (NE)	Coyne	Gonzalez
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Goode
Bartlett	Crane	Goodlatte
Barton	Crowley	Goodling
Bass	Cubin	Gordon
Bateman	Cummings	Goss
Becerra	Cunningham	Graham
Bentsen	Danner	Green (TX)
Bereuter	Davis (FL)	Green (WI)
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Greenwood
Berry	Davis (VA)	Gutierrez
Biggert	Deal	Gutknecht
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hall (OH)
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Bishop	Delahunt	Hansen
Blagojevich	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Bliley	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	DeMint	Hayes
Blunt	Deutsch	Hayworth
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Boehner	Dickey	Herger
Bonilla	Dicks	Hill (IN)
Bonior	Dingell	Hill (MT)
Bono	Dixon	Hilleary
Borski	Doggett	Hinchey
Boswell	Dooley	Hinojosa
Boucher	Doolittle	Hobson
Boyd	Doyle	Hoeffel
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hoekstra
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Holden
Brown (CA)	Edwards	Holt
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Hooley
Brown (OH)	Ehrlich	Horn
Bryant	Emerson	Hostettler
Burr	Engel	Houghton
Burton	English	Hoyer
Calvert	Eshoo	Hulshof
Camp	Etheridge	Hutchinson
Campbell	Ewing	Hyde
Canady	Farr	Inslee
Capuano	Fattah	Isakson
Cardin	Filner	Istook
Carson	Fletcher	Jackson (IL)
Castle	Foley	Jackson-Lee
Chabot	Forbes	(TX)
Chambliss	Ford	Jefferson

Jenkins	Moore	Shaw
John	Moran (KS)	Shays
Johnson (CT)	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Johnson, E. B.	Morella	Sherwood
Johnson, Sam	Murtha	Shimkus
Jones (NC)	Myrick	Shows
Jones (OH)	Nadler	Shuster
Kanjorski	Napolitano	Simpson
Kaptur	Neal	Sisisky
Kasich	Nethercutt	Skeen
Kelly	Ney	Skelton
Kennedy	Northup	Slaughter
Kildee	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Kilpatrick	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Kind (WI)	Oberstar	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Obey	Smith (WA)
Kingston	Olver	Snyder
Klecza	Ortiz	Souder
Klink	Ose	Spratt
Knollenberg	Owens	Stabenow
Kolbe	Oxley	Stark
Kucinich	Packard	Stearns
Kuykendall	Pallone	Stenholm
LaFalce	Pascrell	Strickland
LaHood	Pastor	Stump
Lampson	Paul	Stupak
Lantos	Payne	Sununu
Largent	Pease	Sweeney
Larson	Pelosi	Talent
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Tancredo
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Tanner
Lazio	Petri	Tauscher
Leach	Phelps	Tauzin
Lee	Pickering	Taylor (MS)
Levin	Pickett	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Terry
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Linder	Porter	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Portman	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Thune
Lofgren	Pryce (OH)	Thurman
Lowe	Quinn	Tiahrt
Lucas (KY)	Radanovich	Tierney
Lucas (OK)	Rahall	Toomey
Luther	Ramstad	Towns
Maloney (CT)	Rangel	Trafficant
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Turner
Manzullo	Reyes	Udall (CO)
Markey	Reynolds	Udall (NM)
Martinez	Riley	Upton
Mascara	Rivers	Velazquez
Matsui	Rodriguez	Vento
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Visclosky
McCarthy (NY)	Rogan	Walden
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Walsh
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
McGovern	Rothman	Waters
McHugh	Roukema	Watt (NC)
McInnis	Roybal-Allard	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Royce	Waxman
McIntyre	Ryan (WI)	Weiner
McKeon	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (FL)
McNulty	Sabo	Weldon (PA)
Meehan	Salmon	Weller
Meek (FL)	Sanchez	Wexler
Meeks (NY)	Sanders	Weygand
Menendez	Sandlin	Whitfield
Metcalfe	Sanford	Wicker
Mica	Sawyer	Wilson
Millender	Saxton	Wise
McDonald	Scarborough	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Schaffer	Woolsey
Miller, Gary	Schakowsky	Wu
Miller, George	Scott	Wynn
Minge	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Mink	Serrano	Young (FL)
Moakley	Sessions	
Mollohan	Shadegg	

NOT VOTING—17

Berman	Evans	McKinney
Buyer	Everett	Rogers
Callahan	Granger	Rush
Cannon	Hilliard	Spence
Capps	Hunter	Watkins
Dunn	McCollum	

□ 1505

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 603, CLARIFYING THE APPLICATION OF THE ACT POPULARLY KNOWN AS THE "DEATH ON THE HIGH SEAS ACT" TO AVIATION INCIDENTS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-37) on the resolution (H. Res. 85) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 603) to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation incidents, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 661, CONDITIONALLY PROHIBITING THE OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-38) on the resolution (H. Res. 86) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 661) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels if the European Union adopts certain aircraft noise regulations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 87) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for the purpose of explaining the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my pleasure to announce that the Committee on House Administration now has its full complement of members on both sides of the aisle, and this resolution constitutes the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, consisting of the chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS); and the Joint Committee on Printing, the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio

(Mr. BOEHNER), the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 87

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following joint committees of Congress, to serve with the chairman of the Committee on House Administration:

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Boehner, Mr. Ehlers, Mr. Hoyer, and Mr. Davis of Florida.

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Boehner, Mr. Ney, Mr. Hoyer, and Mr. Fattah.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 88) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 88

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and he is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Mr. Isakson.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Mr. Isakson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STEARNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONDEMNING THE CUBAN DICTATORSHIP'S CRACKDOWN ON THE INTERNAL OPPOSITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Cuban dictatorship has carried out a brutal crackdown of the brave internal opposition and independent press, taking Cuba's four best known internal opponents, Felix Bonne Carcasses, Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello, Vladimiro Roca Antunez, and Rene Gomez Manzano, to trial on trumped-up charges, and arresting scores of other peaceful opponents without cause or justification.

The internal opposition in Cuba is working intensely and valiantly to draw international attention to Cuba's deplorable human rights situation, and continues to strengthen and grow, despite the Stalinist repression, in its opposition to the Castro dictatorship.

At this time of extraordinary repression, the internal opposition requires and deserves the firm and unwavering support and solidarity of the international community. The Cuban dictatorships repressive crackdown against the brave internal opposition and the independent press must be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

□ 1515

The internal opposition and independent press of Cuba have our profound admiration and firm solidarity.

We must demand of the Cuban dictatorship the release of all political prisoners, the legalization of all political parties, labor unions and the press, and the scheduling of free and fair internationally supervised elections.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the government of Spain, of Prime Minister Aznar, to cancel the announced trip to Castro's Cuba of the King of Spain; and I call upon the member states of the Ibero-American summit to boycott the upcoming meeting that has been, incredibly, scheduled for November in the capital of the Cuban dictatorship.

Martin Luther King rightfully declared that an injustice anywhere is an affront to injustice everywhere. Going to Cuba to shake the Cuban tyrant's hand would be an ultimately immoral act. Now, more than ever, it is incumbent upon the entire international community to demonstrate firm solidarity with the oppressed people of

Cuba and with the brave internal opposition.

According to press reports from Cuba, the following dissidents and journalists have been arrested by the Cuban dictatorship in the last few days:

Efren Martinez Pulgaron, Ana Maria Ortega Jimenez, Marisela Pompa, Angel Polanco, Odilia Collazo, Arnaldo Ramos, Lazaro Rodriguez, Jose Orlando Gonzalez Bridon, Lazaro Cala, Felix Perera, Oswaldo Paya Sardinas, Ofelia Nardo Cruz, Regis Iglesias, Angel Moya Acosta, Miriam Cantillo, Benigno Torralba, Ramon Alfonso William, Gisela Concepcion Bolanos, Marvin Hernandez Monzon, Jesus David Martinez Garcia, Julian Martinez Baez, Juan Francisco Monzon Oviedo, Nestor Rodriguez Lobaina, Ivan Hernandez Carrillo, Felix Navarro Rodriguez, Pedro H. Rojas, Leonel Morejon Almagro, Reinaldo Cosano Allen, Jesus Llanes Pelletier, Maria Menendez Villar, Oscar Elias Biscet, Rolando Munoz Yyobre, Miriam Cantillo, Omar Rodriguez Saludos, Diosdado Gonzalez Marrero, Ileana Somiellán Fleitas, Nanci Sotolongo, Odalys Curbelo, Juan Antonio Sanchez, Hector Cruz, Israel Bayon, Raul Rivero and Orlando Bordon.

There are certainly many others who have been arrested but who we have not been able to find out about as of yet.

Mr. Speaker, our admiration, our support, and our prayers go out to all of these brave Cuban patriots and to all of the suffering and oppressed Cuban people.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today is a special day, particularly in Texas, because in Texas March 2 is Texas Independence Day. In 1836, 163 years ago today, the Republic of Texas was born. As I left Houston this morning, spring is coming to Texas. The bluebonnets are blooming, and we are actually seeing a lot of changes, and that is what has happened in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, let me set the stage for what happened 163 years ago. On March 1, 1836, 54 delegates representing settlements across Texas gathered for the Texas Convention of 1836 in a small farm village at Washington-on-the-Brazos.

From the beginning, it was an event marked by haste and urgency because Santa Anna's forces were closing in on the defenders of the Alamo. Within days it would fall, setting off a chain reaction of defeats for the small Texas Army, which would nevertheless emerge victorious at the battle of San Jacinto 6 weeks later on April 21. March 2 is when the delegates in Washington-on-the-Brazos actually drew up the Constitution and declared independence.

Mr. Speaker, what were these brave Texans fighting for? Up to this point, it was simply to restore the Mexican Constitution of 1824, which had been suspended by Santa Anna.

On the night of March 1, a group of five men stayed up late into the night drafting the document that would be approved the next day by the full convention, a document that echoes the lines of its American counterpart, the Texas Declaration of Independence.

It started off in much the same way, with the words, "When a government has ceased to protect the lives, liberty and property of the people." It spoke of the numerous injustices inflicted upon the settlers of the state of Coahuila y Tejas: the elimination of the state's legislative body, the denial of religious freedom, the elimination of the civil justice system, and the confiscation of firearms being the most intolerable, particularly in Texas.

Finally, it ended with the declaration that, because of the injustice of Santa Anna's tyrannical government, Texans were severing their connection with the Mexican nation and declaring themselves "a free, sovereign, and independent republic. . . fully invested with all the rights and attributes" that belong to independent nations; and a declaration that they "fearlessly and confidently" committed their decision to "the Supreme arbiter of the destinies of nations."

Over the next 2 weeks, a constitution was drafted and an interim government was formed, despite daily reports from the front detailing the collapse of the Alamo and subsequent advance of the Mexican Army through Texas. On March 17, 1836, the government was forced to flee Washington-on-the-Brazos on the news of the advance of General Santa Anna.

Just over a month later, however, independence would be secured in the form of a victory over that same army by Sam Houston, a delegate at the very convention, and his courageous fighters at the battle of San Jacinto.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind folks from Tennessee that Sam Houston served in this Congress from the State of Tennessee. I have at times kidded my friends from Tennessee saying, "The best of Tennessee immigrated to Texas in the 1830s."

From that point on, Texas was firmly established in the community of nations; and for 10 years she stood and remained an independent nation, until President James K. Polk signed the treaty admitting Texas to the United States in 1845.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress and the whole country will join us today on March 2 in a day that in Texas we celebrate, our schoolchildren celebrate, Texas Independence Day.

GOOD EDUCATION FOR OUR CHILDREN WILL ENSURE AMERICA'S FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress, and I am here today, because I believe that our children's education must be the number one priority in this country. We must prepare all of our children for the high-skill, high-wage jobs that will ensure America's leadership in the world marketplace and, at the same time prevent dependency on welfare here at home.

Public education is the backbone of our country. It is why we are a great Nation. Public education must be available to all, and it must be the best in the world. Public education does not discriminate; and it must be strengthened, not weakened.

This Congress, we have an opportunity that comes along only once every 5 years, and that is the opportunity to review and update the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA.

ESEA is best known for Title I, the education for the disadvantaged. ESEA is known for the dollars it sends to schools. Title I is important because it helps disadvantaged children achieve along with their more fortunate peers, and it helps poor and impacted schools and school districts keep up with the more advantaged schools and school districts in this Nation.

Title I must be supported; and, as well, we must ensure that every child gets individual attention in the early grades to build a solid foundation for future learning. We can do this by making the administration's initiative to reduce class size permanent. This initiative helps school districts recruit, hire, and train enough qualified teachers to reduce class size to an average of 18 in grades 1 through 3.

Current research findings prove what parents and teachers have known for years: Kids who are in smaller class sizes learn better, especially in the lower grades. Our schools need 100,000 new, well-trained teachers.

We also know how hard it is for children even in small classes to learn in trailers or in old school buildings that are crumbling around them. I support the President's proposal to make it easier for school districts to fund needed schools and to build new ones by providing interest rate subsidies for school construction bonds over the next 2 years. Is it not time to show all of our children that their school is as important as a shopping mall or as a prison?

While I certainly support the current emphasis on ending social promotions, ESEA is also the place to assist all schools in preventing students from failing in the first place. Title XI of ESEA lets school districts spend up to 5 percent of their Federal education funds on coordinated services, services that will bring schools and their local communities together to make sure that, every day, every student comes to school ready to learn. Services such as health care, before and after school

care, and tutoring ensure that no child is doomed to fail before they even enter the classroom.

There are wonderful examples all around the Nation of schools and communities working together to lift children and their families out of an endless cycle of failure and into a future of success.

Students who are ready to learn need well-trained teachers who are experts in their subjects. They need a challenging curriculum and up-to-date technology to prepare them for the sophisticated world we live in. Every student, regardless of family income, race or gender must have access to the most modern technological education available.

In addition, teachers as well as students must have mentors; and they must have support for learning to use technology so that they will be comfortable and knowledgeable in a technological environment.

As a member of both the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Science, I am excited to have this significant opportunity to make positive changes in our children's education; to remove any economic or gender gap in science, math and technology; to ensure small classes with well-trained teachers; to provide funding for modern, safe schools; and to give all students a world-class education.

Mr. Speaker, children are only 25 percent of our population, but they are 100 percent of our future. A sound public school system is how we protect that future. A good education for all of our children will ensure America's future.

CONGRESS MUST HELP THE PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the issue of Sudan. But, before I do, I want to just pay tribute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for taking his time and getting involved in a very important issue with regard to slavery in Sudan.

I also want to congratulate the students at Highline Community School in Aurora, Colorado. They have done an amazing thing with regard to getting people who were in slavery in southern Sudan free.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Sudan on three different occasions. The world does not know it, but these students in Colorado know it. There is slavery going on in Sudan, and these students are making a tremendous effort. Because of them, 1,000 slaves have been released, and I just want to take out this special order in tribute to them.

Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, the students of Barbara Vogel's fourth grade class have been raising money to help free slave children as part of the public awareness

campaign called S.T.O.P., Slavery That Oppresses People. These young people, modern-day abolitionists, are an inspiration to many. If my colleagues saw the CBS Dan Rather show, one of the youngsters I believe called himself a modern-day abolitionist. If only the Congress could follow their lead or if the administration could follow their lead.

Almost 2 million people have died, 2 million have died in Sudan in the past 15 years. More have died in Sudan than have died in Somalia, in Kosovo, in Rwanda and in Bosnia combined. The most recent statistics available put the number dead at 1.8 million, but that does not cover the 200,000 who have died from the famines this past summer.

Mr. Speaker, millions of people are starving in southern Sudan, kept alive only by the brave efforts of international humanitarian organizations like World Vision, Save the Children, Catholic Relief, UNICEF, and others. Millions are being displaced. An entire generation has been lost, and another generation is ready to be lost.

□ 1530

The word "genocide" is now used with regard to what is taking place in Sudan. In the Numba Mountains, the Christians and Muslims are being persecuted. The Sudanese government are persecuting these people because of their faith. The government planes use high-altitude bombings to demolish civilian targets like hospitals and terrorize the population.

We know that women and children from Southern Sudan are being sold into slavery; and today, March 2, 1999, Sudanese women and children are being bought and sold as we sit and stand here today. They are kidnapped by slave raiders who sweep into the destabilized regions following the government attacks. They capture the women and children and then they take them off for slavery.

I want to commend my colleagues' attention to this excellent booklet which hopefully will be sent to every Congressional office from the U.S. Committee For Refugees. Tomorrow they will announce a nationwide public awareness campaign about Sudan. I urge the Members of this body to get a copy of this booklet.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) for his coming here quickly, getting started on a very powerful, very important issue. This may be the major human rights issue of the world. Two million people have died. Also, the students of Highline School are trying to help to save one life at a time by raising money to free women and children from the trading block.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I received letters from the youngsters which I would like to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Nicole Limino said to me, "Dear Congressman Wolf, it makes me feel so sad

that people just like me are being treated like animals. This needs to be stopped. Someone needs to take a stand. Please help eradicate slavery by writing the government and telling them something needs to be done."

Doni Tarplus said, "Will you please help us abolish slavery? The President isn't helping even when he promised to make the world a better place."

A boy who identified himself as Melvin said, "I'm Melvin. I'm demanding you ask people if they want to help. The United Nations isn't doing anything about slavery in Sudan. I was broken-hearted when I found that 409 people were found and brought from slavery."

David Walker said, "You are a congressman so you can help. Millions of lives are in danger and you can get the government to help. Slavery is going on and we need to stop it."

Then there are many other letters which I would like to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In closing, slavery is a problem. Starvation is a problem. The United States can do more to help. We can appoint a special envoy. He can go back and tell the students from Highline Community School that the Clinton administration has a special envoy. They appointed an envoy, Senator Mitchell, who deserves a Nobel Peace Prize for bringing people together in Ireland, Northern Ireland, Southern Ireland.

Let us appoint a Sam Nunn, a Senator Nunn to be the special envoy to bring peace in this region and stop the slavery, stop the suffering, stop the agony and the pain.

The students from the area of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), from Highline Community School, are, frankly, I hate to say this, they are doing more than the Congress is doing, both parties, Republican and Democratic Party, they are doing more than both parties. Lastly, they are doing much more, much more than the Clinton administration is doing.

I just hope that their effort as a witness by what they are doing will sensitize this administration whereby President Clinton, within the next week or so, will appoint a special envoy who will go to Sudan and go back and forth and mediate between the warring parties whereby these people will know that they can have a future for their children and grandchildren, and slavery will stop, and people will not be persecuted because they happen to accept Christ and they happen to be Christians, because of their faith.

Mr. Speaker, the letters that I referred to are as follows:

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,
Aurora, CO, February 22, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: I know you are also a freedom fighter and this is one reason we need you! We need your strong caring voice to help us end slavery in Sudan. Please hear the cry for freedom that these beautiful, young, Americans put to their government! The media is giving a lot of attention to these young voices can you help us too?

In Freedom,

BARB VOGEL.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: At the beginning of the year I found out that slavery was still going on. I also found out that the class before us had started a campaign called S.T.O.P., S.T.O.P. stands for Slavery That Oppresses People. It makes me feel terrible that people just like me are being treated like animals. This needs to be stopped. Someone needs to take a stand. Please help us eradicate slavery by writing the government and telling them something needs to be done. If you have any questions please call us at (303) 364-7657 or look for information at www.anti-slavery.org.

Help Them,

NICOLE CIMINO.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: Slavery should not be going on: It should be eradicated. A few weeks ago on February fourth, 409 people were put into slavery. That makes me really mad! I am Doni Tarplus in Barbs fourth grade class. I am an abolitionist, an abolitionist is a person who wants to free slaves.

Will you please help us abolish slavery? The president isn't helping when he promised to make the world a better place. For more information please call us at, (303) 364-7657 or try our website at www.anti-slavery.org.

Thanks,

DONI TARPLUS.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: I'm Melvin and I'm demanding you ask people if they want to help or you help because the United Nations aren't doing anything about slavery in Sudan! Barb's old class made S.T.O.P. but we're continuing this campaign. S.T.O.P. stands for Slavery That Oppresses People. I was broken-hearted when I found out that 409 people were found and brought into slavery. If you want to do a donation, you can contact Christian Solidarity International, American anti-slavery group, or visit us on the web at WWW.anti-slavery.org.

Sincerely,

MELVIN.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: You are a congressman so you can help. Millions of lives are in danger and you can get the government to help. Slavery is going on and we need to stop it that is why we started a campaign called S.T.O.P. It stands for Slavery That Oppresses People. We started this campaign because the government won't take a stand. Please help us eradicate slavery.

Sincerely,

DAVID WALKER.

P.S. On February 4, 1999 John Eibner gave the south of Sudan an urgent appeal about the north attacking them but they didn't listen so now 409 women and children are in slavery.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: Hi! My name is Alex Persinger and I feel like a dead hog, because on February 4, 1999, on that day 409 people were enslaved! Please give the government awareness about slavery. People like us work all day because of lazy people.

Please remember the urgent appeal by John Eibner. I love to help but I can only tell so many! People like you can make a difference.

Love,

ALEX PERSINGER.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: My name is Thomas Turner, an adolescent abolitionist that is trying to eradicate slavery, but that is not the reason I'm writing you. The reason is because a man named John Eibner had urgently appealed the U.N. to take a stand about the slavery issue, but they all probably sat lazier than ever and because of that 409 people are slaved in modern day slavery. We'll get up and take a huge stand right now! You can contact us at www.anti-slavery.org or 1-800-884-0719. Make a difference.

Love,

THOMAS TURNER.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: I am an abolitionist in a campaign called S.T.O.P. S.T.O.P. stands for Slavery That Oppresses People. We heard a very disappointing thing about some slaves. John Eibner, a man who works for a humanitarian group called C.S.I sent a urgent appeal to the government about this and that the soldiers were going to raid the villages, but they didn't do anything. On February 4, 1999 four hundred nine innocent people were taken into a miserable life being treated like animals. When I found out about this, I was heartbroken to know that so many people could be taken into bondage. The good news is that we freed 850 slaves.

Join us to eradicate and abolish slavery. Please help us by writing to people that are important. If you have any questions you can reach us at (303) 364-7657.

Please help us,

LINDY DE SPAIN.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: I'm Miriam a concerned youngster in the STOP campaign it stands for Slavery That Oppresses People. This is a human rights campaign, we try to end slavery. I thought slavery had been eliminated. We freed slaves last week but Sudan was attacked and four hundred-nine people were put into slavery it was shocking. We need your help and spread the word that slavery exists please helps us! The government has sat idly by, for years and years. John Eibner works for CSI he goes to Sudan and frees slaves. He had sent an urgent appeal that Sudan was being attacked to the United Nations but no response, they ignored this awful issue and they ignored this awful issue too often!

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: Hi! I am Josh Hook, an abolitionist. I have some devastating news to tell you. A few days ago John Eibner went to Sudan and he was told that the north was ready to fight. So John told the U.N. but they ignored him. Then four hundred nine people were put in slavery. Just because the government did not do a single thing!

We started a campaign called S.T.O.P. S.T.O.P. stands for slavery that oppresses people. Will you use your voice to tell your fellow colleagues or contact C.S.I. or A.A.S.G.

Love,

JOSH HOOK.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: Hi! My name is Dong, this is devastating news! On February 4, 1999 four hundred nine people were put in slavery! John Eibner sent a urgent appeal to the United Nations, but they

did nothing. Right now I feel distraught. Please help us! Please join our S.T.O.P. campaign and help us free slaves! Women and children just like me are now put in slavery. I demand you to help us! My heart is frowning because this is going on, my heart is crying. I forgot to tell you that the north attacked a village. John Eibner warned them but they did nothing. Also S.T.O.P. stands for Slavery That Oppresses People. Please help us abolish slavery and please bring awareness to the world!

Sincerely,

DONG CHA.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: I'm so furious at the government for not listening to us. Last Week 409 people were enslaved because the government did not listen to us. Just like you and me enslaved. Women and children are enslaved. The bad part too is that the government ignored John Eibners warning. He found out that the soldiers were going to raid them. He also sent an urgent appeal to the United Nations.

P.S. We will eradicate slavery.

Love,

JOSHUA FLEMING.

Highline Community School,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: My name is Alphonso Terell McDonald and I am nine years old. I am a young abolitionist and I am writing to you because I want to tell you about what happened just recently, four hundred-nine slaves were captured and were brought back into slavery because the government is sitting idly by instead of taking a stand. We would like to know if you'd contact the United States Government and let them know what is going on. We would be so grateful if you did this because we want people to be aware of this so they can help us.

The quote that is on the back of our shirts "The greatest sin of our time is not the few who have destroyed, but the vast majority who have sat idly by."

Love,

ALPHONSO.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: I want to tell you what just happened, there were 409 nice, beautiful, innocent, people put into to slavery.

I almost cried; but I realized if I'm a abolitionist, I can put a stop to this slavery issue! This should not be happening to these people! "These are our people we should stop this slavery!" You can help us by writing letters to the government and tell them to put a stop like all of the abolitionist like Frederick Douglas, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.,

Love,

CYNTHIA JURANGO.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: Hi! My name is Heather Pedigo, with a strong urge to fight for freedom of other people! I want to tell you something because of the governments act of turning their back on the issue of slavery, because of that, on February fourth, four hundred and nine people were put into slavery! Just think all of those scared and hurt women and children. We are very ashamed. Please contact us at WWW.Anti-Slavery, or you can call us at 1-800-804-0719.

Sincerely,

HEATHER PEDIGO.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK: Hi, My name is Christina Manalastas. On February 4th, four hundred nine slaves went into slavery. I'm not happy about what is going on all around the world! It is, of course, the moral thing, when seeing a other human being suffer, to look after them. The person Dalai Lama had said that quote. Here is my quote, "We care about happiness, we care about sadness but we just want to help."

Sincerely,

CHRISTINA MANALASTAS.

P.S. Will you please join us.

HIGHLINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL,

Aurora, CO, February 17, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF: Hi! From Barb's class. Im a young abolitionist and a fourth grader at Highline. I am in a group that is called S.T.O.P. S.T.O.P is Slavery That Oppresses People. Just last week 409 people went into slavery. The United Nations did not help! I felt so bad! I'm going to eradicate slavery this year! As I was saying on the fourth of February, 1999 John Eibner went to Sudan to warn them about people coming and taking them from their homes. So stand up and do what is right! I will not give up will you? Will you help us stop slavery?

Love,

STACY CARUSO.

DO NOT FORGET ABOUT THE KASHMIRI PANDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the world witnessed an exciting event last month when India's Prime Minister Vajpayee met with his Pakistani counterpart, Prime Minister Sharif, to inaugurate a new bus service between the two countries.

I applaud Prime Minister Vajpayee's courage in visiting his neighboring country with whom relations have been tense, to put it mildly. But amidst the celebrations about the meeting between the India and the Pakistani prime ministers, a disturbing development from the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir reminds us of what is at stake in the conflict that has hung over the subcontinent for decades.

As the New York Times reported, "On the eve of Mr. Vajpayee's visit to Lahore, Islamic militants, whom Indians generally believe are backed by Pakistan, massacred 20 Hindu civilians in three places in Jammu, part of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, apparently in an attempt to derail the peace efforts. In one case, they opened fire on a wedding party, killing eight celebrants." This is from the New York Times, February 23.

The article noted that Prime Minister Vajpayee did not publicly address the massacres during his visit to Pakistan, perhaps understandable in light of the positive atmosphere that the meeting of the two prime ministers was intended to generate. But Prime Minister Vajpayee stressed that he had warned his Pakistani counterpart that

the continued campaign of terrorism against innocent civilians in Jammu and Kashmir is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of Kashmir frequently gets mentioned in the geopolitical calculations over the larger India-Pakistan conflict. There is overwhelming evidence of Pakistani covert support for the continued terror campaign in Jammu and Kashmir. There has, at the same time, been an overt Pakistani effort to internationalize this issue by bringing the United States, or other world powers and international organizations, into the negotiations. The one aspect of this tragedy that frequently is overlooked is the plight of the Hindu community of this region, the so-called Kashmiri Pandits.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to reiterate my calls for increased American and world attention to the plight of the Kashmiri Pandits, victims of massacres and displacement, such as the atrocity of last month.

As I have gotten to know the Kashmiri-American community and hearing about the situation facing the Kashmiri Pandits, I have become increasingly outraged, not only at the terrible abuses they have suffered but at the seeming indifference of the world community.

At the same time, I am impressed by the dignity and the determination that the Kashmiri Pandits have maintained despite these horrible conditions. I am touched by the deep concern that the Kashmiri-Americans feel for their brothers and sisters living in Kashmir or in the refugee center set up in India to accommodate the Pandits driven from their homes in the Kashmir Valley.

Recently, my colleagues in the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans asked me to co-chair a Task Force on Kashmir. I look forward to working with my colleagues to focus increased Congressional attention on this issue.

Some of my colleagues and I have already been pressing these issues, but clearly we need to give the plight of the Kashmiri Pandits greater recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked India's National Human Rights Commission to consider declaring the Kashmiri Pandits an Internally Displaced People and provide conditions for the safe return of the Pandit community to the Kashmir Valley.

I have also asked the Commission to substantiate the ongoing genocide that the Pandits are suffering. I would also encourage the Indian government to consider officially recognizing the Kashmiri Pandit community as a minority under Indian law to provide additional benefits and protection.

Mr. Speaker, the Kashmiri Pandits have an ancient and a proud culture. Their roots in the Valley run deep. Virtually the entire population of 300,000 Kashmiri Pandits has been forced to leave their ancestral homes and property.

Today, only 2,000 Kashmiri Pandits remain in the Valley. Threatened with violence and intimidation, they have been turned into refugees in their own country.

Although Pakistani officials maintain that their country only provides "moral and political support" for the insurgency, evidence shows that Pakistan has been playing a direct role in arming and training the militants who have converted the Kashmir Valley from an earthly paradise into a living hell.

Last year, I urged Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to raise the Kashmiri Pandit issue whenever Kashmir is discussed by the United States and India. I have also asked the Indian government to bring up the Pandits issue in any bilateral discussion between India and Pakistan.

The United Nations Human Rights Commission also needs to address the Kashmiri Pandit issue, including it in its periodic reports on Kashmir, as well as through the Commission Subcommittee on Minorities. I will also continue urging action by UNICEF to provide educational grants to benefit the Kashmiri Pandit children and the World Health Organization support to improve health and sanitation.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, in the great international debate over arms control and security issues, it is sometimes all too easy to overlook the so-called small problem of one persecuted ethnic group. I just hope that the United States and India, as the world's two largest democracies, will show determination to finally address this humanitarian catastrophe that the Kashmiri Pandits are facing in an effective and humane way.

PROMISES MADE AND PROMISES KEPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, in 1995, we talked about promises that were made and promises that we needed to keep. We talked specifically about the budget. It is hard to remember, but just 4 years ago, the deficit was nearing \$300 billion. The debt was skyrocketing. What did that mean to Americans? That meant that interest rates on mortgages, on cars, on college loans were soaring through the roof. In fact, it looked like there was no end in sight to deficit after deficit after deficit.

So we stepped up to the challenge. We presented the first plan to balance America's budget in a generation. We heard the President. We heard the Vice President. We heard many Members on the left. We heard the media talking about how balancing the budget under our plan in 7 years would destroy the economy. In fact, that is what the President said.

Well, we did not listen to the naysayers. We fought. We passed our plan. The President still objected. In fact, that fall, he vetoed nine bills,

shut down the Federal Government and, as only the President can do, blamed it on us.

Well, we kept the fight alive. Finally, in 1997, amid troubling reports that if the President did nothing the budget would balance itself, he decided to come to the table and sign the plan that would balance our budget for the first time in a generation.

We listened to Alan Greenspan in 1995. Greenspan said, in 1995, if we followed the Republican plan, the John Kasich plan to balance the budget, we would see unprecedented growth in our time. We would see college loans and interest rates go down. We would see mortgages interest rates going down. We would see economic explosion. Well, we kept our word. We kept the fight alive. Finally, the President came to the table. We signed the plan, and the economy has prospered because of it.

Now, 2 years later, we are again faced with a decision. Do we follow political expediency? Do we follow the easy route that was followed by the Democratic Chamber in this House for 40 years? Do we play the game the way they used to play the game? Or do we keep our word on budgetary issues?

We laid out budget caps in 1997. We said, this is how we are going to run our Federal Government for the next 5 years. It was very simple. The caps were laid out. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said, this is the way we need to go. Well, I agreed with him then, and I agree with him now.

We have to continue remaining fiscally disciplined. If we do that, we will not only see the economy continue to explode, we will not only continue to see interest rates going down, we will see something else happen that has not happened in Washington for a long time. We will see a group of leaders who are truly respected across the country for keeping their word.

Because, in the end, this is not about a deficit. This is not about budgetary issues. This is about whether our elected leaders in Washington, D.C., say what they mean and mean what they say. Promises made, promises kept. It made sense in 1995, and it makes sense in 1999.

SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, last week, we had Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in front of the Committee on International Relations delivering an address detailing activities of the Department of State over the last year, identifying all of the hot spots in the world where American interests were at stake, identifying what the United States of America was doing about them.

It was intriguing, Mr. Speaker, because, in over half an hour of a normal presentation and certainly maybe 20 or

30 pages of written presentation that discussed in every way all of the issues that we could possibly confront in foreign policy position, there was one that was conspicuous for its absence, one spot in the world that was never mentioned, one nation that was never brought to the attention of the Committee on International Relations or, as a matter of fact, it has not been brought to the attention of this Nation by this administration, and that is the nation of Sudan.

There, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) said so eloquently a little bit ago, in the last 15 years, over 2 million people have died in that civil war. That is more than have died in Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Rwanda combined. Yet, in the face of this tragedy, what we have seen has been a lackluster attempt on the part of this administration to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked by a teacher at Highline Community School, which is in the Cherry Creek School District in my District, a class again to which my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, referred, I was asked by her to deliver a message to the Secretary of State; and I did.

The message was in the form of a question from Ms. Vogel, the teacher of this class, this fourth and fifth grade class, to the Secretary of State; and it said essentially this, "Why is it that you, the government of our own country, and members of the world community, have decided to turn a blind eye to the tortured land of the Sudan?"

□ 1545

And I communicated that concern to the Secretary and I got a response, a written response, from someone in her office. I delivered that response yesterday to the school in my district. It was one of the most incredible experiences of the time I have spent in public life; to look at these children and this teacher, who have committed and dedicated themselves to the ominous task of raising money to free human beings that have been dragged into slavery in a country all the way around the world.

This class read about this situation over a year ago and became so concerned that they organized a group that is now worldwide. They call it STOP, Slavery That Oppresses People. It has raised over \$100,000. This 4th grade class in Highline Community School has raised \$100,000 and purchased the freedom of over 1,000 individuals in the Sudan. Mr. Speaker, in the entire world we have been able to muster enough support to purchase the freedom of a total of 5,000, yet 1,000 come from this one classroom, this one elementary school. It is really quite extraordinary, and it was an extraordinary day yesterday.

I will enter them into the RECORD, but I want to read a couple of the cards I received yesterday. Each student wrote a personal card, a personal message to me, and some of them are real-

ly quite moving. I will not go through them all, but just some of them. And, remember, these are, again, 5th graders.

"Our hearts are noble, so we use the noble heart to do good for others." By Dong Cho.

"Dear Congressman: Hi, I'm Christina Manalostas. We bring love and courage from our life, and give it to others in sadness."

"God must have put us here on earth for a reason. That reason was not to put people in slavery or to separate races. He put us here to live free, to have freedom. He just wanted to give everyone an opportunity for everything. Love, Charles."

"There is nothing worse than seeing a person suffer for what they believe in." Deven Eastman.

I can go on and on like that, Mr. Speaker, but I will not. I will enter them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I will tell my colleagues that what these children have done and what they are continuing to do far surpasses the efforts that the whole government of the United States has put forward to date, and I simply want to commend them and thank them from the bottom of my heart for such an inspirational day as I spent yesterday.

The personal messages referred to above are as follows:

I thank God for using these children to remind me of the true spirit of giving! We have love for all people in the world!

BARB VOGEL.

"Caring is living the meaning of life."—Richard Lucas, Age 13, Upper Arlington, OH.

If we can eradicate slavery then the world will be a better place.

Love,

CYNTHIA JARANGO.

"Maybe if we looked deep inside ourselves we would find the roots of today's problems and also the solutions. Man creates problems through his temptation; maybe he could solve them through caring."—Alicia Hartman, Age 17, Northeast, PA.

A lot of beautiful souls are in slavery and it needs to stop.

KRISTIN YOUNG.

"A nation with citizens who care and look out for each other is a great nation; it will not fall apart."—Dwain Simmons, Age 14, Houston, TX.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAN: Thank you for coming to our class. Also, thank you for supporting our campaign. I am an abolitionist and my name is Lè Shai.

Sincerely,

LÈ SHAI.

When you put your mind to something, you can achieve anything.

JOSHUA FLEMING.

If we didn't eradicate slavery how would other people be free?

Sincerely,

DAVID WALKER.

Power is in people! Don't be lazy take action to help others.

Love,

ALEX J. PERSINGER.

Even though Frederick Douglass is dead, I still believe that his spirit lives in every abolitionist in the world.

MELVIN HARMON.

The greatest power of our time is love for all people!

Love,

THOMAS TURNER.

Unless the world is perfect, without any problems, we need to take a stand and help others.

LINDY DESPAIN.

The world needs the caring majority.

Love,

ALPHONSO McDONALD.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to thank you for joining our campaign. We appreciate your work.

Love,

JAMES COLEMAN.

Slavery is wrong, and someone needs to take a stand. Adults are not doing enough, so kids are doing something more.

NICOLE CIMINO.

We can't have just a little group of abolitionists we need a large group.

Love,

JOSH HOOK.

There is a sin, from the past, it is slavery and kids are doing something about it!

Love,

MIRIAM MORENO.

God made us different, because He knew that we would be beautiful!

STACY CARUSO.

Freedom is one of the world's greatest treasures. What has happened to it?

DONI TAIKALUS.

Our hearts are noble, so use the noble heart to do good for others.

DONG CHO.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Hi, I'm Christina Manalastas. We bring love and courage from our life, and give it to others in sadness.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINA MANALASTAS.

God must have put us here on earth for a reason. That reason was not to put people in slavery, or to separate races. He put us here to live free, to have freedom. He just wanted to give everyone an opportunity for everything.

Love,

CHARLES.

There is nothing worse than seeing a person suffer for what they believe in.

KEVEN EASTMAN.

CUBA REMAINS A STALINIST STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the past few weeks the Castro dictatorship has initiated an all-out crackdown on the internal opposition and the independent press, who day after day fight for freedom, for democracy and for human rights in Cuba.

Yesterday, under strict secrecy, four of Cuba's most prominent dissidents, Felix Bonne, Marta Beatriz Roque, Vladimiro Roca and Rene Gomez Manzano were put on trial after spending almost 600 days in prison with no charges filed against them.

The crime committed by these four freedom-loving individuals: Drafting a document that criticizes the Cuban communist regime's repressive policies. And it was entitled "The Homeland Belongs to All of Us." This document called for the establishment of democracy in Cuba and the holding of free elections on the island. The dissidents now face up to 5 years in prison and more on these trumped-up charges.

It has been reported that dozens of independent journalists and other dissidents were summarily rounded up on this past weekend on the eve of the trial. The purpose of this massive wave of arrests was to assure that opponents of the regime did not tell the international community of the Roman circus that the dictatorship dares to call a fair and a just trial.

Despite the strengthening totalitarian nature of the Castro regime, the internal opposition in Cuba continues to work tirelessly to call to the attention of the world the plight of the Cuban people. In response to the valiant efforts of the Cuban internal opposition, merely 2 weeks ago Fidel Castro imposed yet a new law on the island that punishes up to 15 and more years in jail any Cuban who disseminates what the regime considers counterrevolutionary information.

Leading human rights organizations around the world have noted the intensification of human rights abuses on the island of Cuba. Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and the recently released U.S. State Department Human Rights Report all concur that the Cuban regime continues to systematically violate the fundamental civil and political rights of all of its citizens.

Cuba today remains the Stalinist state that it has been for 40 years under Fidel Castro. The rights of freedom of expression, freedom of association, freedom of religion, and all of the other rights that free men and women enjoy are denied to the Cuban people. The latest crackdown is but the most recent example of this four-decade old nightmare that has engulfed the island.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress must continue to raise our voice in support of the freedom fighters in Cuba who day in and day out put their lives on the line to create a Democratic opening on the island.

Last year, during his visit to Cuba, Pope John Paul II called on the Castro dictatorship to open up Cuba to the world. A year after the Pontiff's visit, Castro has not even opened Cuba up to its own people. On the contrary, the regime continues to tighten the noose of repression around the necks of the people of the island.

The people of Cuba need the solidarity of the United States and all the nations of the world. Let us not turn our backs on them at this critical time.

This week my congressional colleagues and I will be submitting a resolution which will detail facts on the Castro regime and on the international community. We call upon the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva to help the Cuban people, because this provides a forum for discussing the human rights situation throughout the world, for condemning abuses and gross violations of these liberties, and for establishing an international mechanism to express support for the protection and defense of these inherent natural rights.

The actions taken by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights establishes a precedence for a further course of action, and it sends a message to the international community that the protection and promotion of human rights is indeed still a priority for all of us. The universal declaration of human rights guides global human rights policy and it asserts that all human beings are born free and should live in dignity with rights.

Religious freedom in Cuba is severely restrained, and we have clergy and lay people who are suffering sustained repression by the Cuban state security apparatus.

The government of Cuba continues to violate the rights of the child as well by engaging in child labor and in child prostitution. It routinely restricts workers' rights, including the right to form independent unions.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to be vigilant in fighting against these violations, and we call on the international community to help us in this hour of need.

PRESERVING, PROTECTING, AND ENHANCING SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, over the course of the next hour, a number of Members, Democrats here in the House, want to explore with our colleagues and with the American people our commitment to preserving and protecting and enhancing our Social Security System. It is my belief that Social Security is one of the best programs that ever came out of this House of Representatives and this Congress and this Nation.

If we reflect back on the history of this program to a time in this very chamber in the 1930s, a time when most of our seniors were left in poverty, left often in disgrace to live destitute in their final years in this country after having built it into the great country that it is, and we reflect back on that

time and compare it to the standard of living available to most seniors in this country today, it is a remarkable development. Over the course of some 60-plus years, thanks to the leadership of the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress, we have a Social Security System that really is something that all of us can be very thankful for.

That was a system that came into effect over very significant Republican opposition, and it took from the 1930s until the 1960s, decades of effort by Democrats in this Congress to move to the second pillar that is so important to the security of our seniors, and that is Medicare.

When my fellow Texan, Lyndon Johnson, signed Medicare into law to assure that those who had some retirement security also had a certain element of health security, nine out of ten of our Republican colleagues in this House, nine out of ten, voted no. They did not believe in Medicare.

And so I think it is important, as we begin what I hope will be a bipartisan effort to bring us together to resolve the issues now about Social Security, that we do so in a bipartisan fashion, not bound by our history, but we also must be mindful of our history. And much of the history of the viewpoints brought to this debate about Social Security is really fairly recent.

The current leader of the Republican House group, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), my colleague from Texas, has a far different attitude about Social Security and about Medicare than I have had and that our great President Lyndon Johnson had, and I believe that most Texans have about Social Security. He has referred to it, back in 1984, as "a bad retirement" and "a rotten trick" on the American people. And he said, just a few years ago, that "I would never have created the Social Security System."

In addition to the comments about Social Security, he said of Medicare, after the Republicans took control of this House, "I resent the fact that when I am 65 I must enroll in Medicare. I deeply and profoundly resent that," he said. "It is an imposition on my life."

So we know that at least when some of the leadership of the Republican Party here in the House come to discuss Social Security and Medicare, though they profess an interest in the same bipartisan solution that ultimately will be necessary, they have a different perspective about Social Security and Medicare than those of us who come from a party that has made Medicare and Social Security a mainstay of our efforts.

Likewise, I was troubled, just after coming to the House here in 1995, to read the banner headline of the newspaper of the Progress in Freedom Foundation. This is the group that was created by our recent Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. It said, "For

freedom's sake, eliminate Social Security." And it proceeded in this banner editorial, on the front page of this publication, to say, "It is time to slay the largest entitlement program of all: Social Security. A more important reason than financial returns for privatizing Social Security is freedom. The government shouldn't be in the business of confiscating people's retirement money and giving them no say where it is invested."

That is perhaps a perspective that could be subject to debate here, but it is a perspective that has characterized the leadership of this Republican Party. So that when they come and offer a meaningless resolution, like that which the House adopted today, that has various platitudes but really does nothing to accomplish any real reform of the Social Security System, we cannot help but be mindful of the perspective and the rigid ideology that they bring that is very negative towards Social Security and Medicare.

I hope that over the course of this debate we can reflect on some of the, I guess the remainder, the leftovers of this rigid ideology that are continuing to serve to restrict our ability to get meaningful changes in Social Security, to preserve and strengthen it, rather than to reform and wreck it.

Now, the leader of our efforts in this regard has been my colleague from California, who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I participated with him earlier today, with the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, in a discussion of a new study to explore who the winners and losers are of the various proposals like that advocated by the Progress in Freedom Foundation and the other people that do not really believe in Social Security and want to abandon the system of the last 60-plus years, and I wonder if my colleague from California (Mr. MATSUI) might focus some attention on the significance of this particular study to our ongoing discussion of Social Security.

□ 1600

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for yielding.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas, as many people know, is on the Subcommittee on Social Security; and his expertise obviously is greatly needed for not only this entire institution but obviously for the country. I appreciate today that he has put together this opportunity for a number of us to speak on the floor of the House on this very, very critical and important issue of Social Security.

I might just mention the importance of Social Security to all Americans. It is probably the most significant program that the Federal Government has put together in the last 100 years, perhaps in the history of our country.

Every American is touched by Social Security; and, unlike what many peo-

ple think, Social Security is not just a program for those people 62 or 65 and older. One-third of the benefits of Social Security goes basically to women, surviving spouses, and minor children, either through the form of survivor's benefits when the breadwinner of a family dies before reaching the age of 65 or, alternatively, when the breadwinner becomes disabled.

All of us understand and know the fact that, without Social Security, many young people in America today would not be able to go on to community college or State college or perhaps a university if, in fact, that breadwinner is injured or perhaps dies. So this program is perhaps the most important program that this Congress, perhaps in our lifetime as Members of Congress, will have to deal with.

Yes, there is a problem with Social Security, demographically. When Social Security was first established, it was considered then a widows' and orphans' fund back in the 1930s, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) has said. There were about 30 people working for each retired individual. Today, there is about three in the workforce for every retired individual; and sometime in the year 2025 there will only be a little over two.

So we must change, we must make modifications, but we must also preserve Social Security as we know it in America today.

I have to say that one area that has me greatly concerned is in the area of tax cuts. The story in the Washington Post and the New York Times, major newspapers throughout the country, over the weekend, is that the Republican leadership would like to lift the so-called spending caps so that we can accommodate additional spending in the defense budget, perhaps additional spending in other areas. That would be fine, I suppose, and we will have to debate that issue when we prepare the budget, hopefully by April 15 when it is due under the budget rules.

There is also talk about a significant huge tax cut, and everyone relates this tax cut to the surplus. We heard the chairman of the Committee on the Budget talk about a \$700 billion tax cut over the next 6 or 10 years. We have heard the Senate Budget Committee chairman talk about an \$800 billion or \$900 billion tax cut over the next decade.

The problem we have, of course, is that over the next 5 or 6 years only \$86 billion of the hundreds of billions of dollars of surplus will be in the form of income tax, both income taxes from corporations and income taxes from individuals. The greatest percentage, 90 percent, of the surplus will be from the Social Security payroll taxes. We cannot afford to use those sums, basically coming out of that very regressive payroll tax, to pay for tax cuts that essentially go to higher income folks.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means already said that. It is going to go to people in the high in-

come bracket because he says they pay more. In fact, we estimated that somebody that makes \$300,000 a year will get about a \$30,000 tax cut, whereas somebody making \$30,000 a year, one-tenth of that, will get about a \$99 per year tax cut, or maybe \$8 a month.

Mr. DOGGETT. Some have suggested that this 10 percent tax cut is just principally designed to help the top 10 percent of Americans.

Mr. MATSUI. There is no question about that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Or maybe the top 1 percent.

Mr. MATSUI. It just goes to the very, very high income groups.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mrs. THURMAN. Maybe another way to put this then is, if we take this surplus, the dollars that are coming in from the payroll taxes, which would be hard-earned folks' money that they spend out of their check, actually would then go to fund a tax cut across the board or potentially across the board, leaving us in a deficit for when they get ready to retire?

Mr. MATSUI. Well, there is no question. I think the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) is absolutely correct. They are basically taking money so there is immediate gratification but at the expense of folks down the road, 5, 10, 15, 20 years down the road.

Mrs. THURMAN. It is out of their tax dollars?

Mr. MATSUI. It is out of their tax dollars.

I will conclude by being very brief, because I would like to talk a little bit about this program that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) spoke about today very briefly. It is very interesting, because Martha McSteen is the chair of the National Committee to Save Social Security and Medicare. Martha McSteen had been a Social Security administrator for 39 years before she retired in 1986. She was the acting administrator of the entire Social Security program from 1983 to 1986, just before she retired.

Believe it or not, that was under the Reagan administration. She was part of this press conference.

And also John Mueller. And I want to just mention John Mueller's background. He is an economist, and he was the chief economist for the Republican Conference, that is the Republican caucus, under the leadership of then chair of the caucus Jack Kemp. They put together this report to look into the whole concept of whether or not we should privatize Social Security. In other words, allow private accounts of either 2 percent or 5 percent or 4 percent, maybe 3 percent, whatever it might be, or maybe all of it.

They have concluded, in their very comprehensive study, that in terms of winners and losers almost every American alive today will be losers under

this program of private accounts, private individual accounts. The only winners will be single males born in the year 2025, 25 years from now and beyond.

The reason for that is because, as all of us know, we have an \$8 trillion unfunded liability because Social Security is basically a pay-as-you-go system. It is a system in which current generations pay for the retirement of past generations, and it is not funded. It is paid out of the payroll taxes and immediately paid out of the Treasury.

As a result of that, if one moves to a new system, where there are private accounts, essentially what happens is that the current generation of workers will be paying two taxes: one for their own retirement maybe 20 or 30 years down the road and the retirement of their mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles and perhaps even their grandparents.

So once we move over to private accounts, we are going to end up doing great damage to every American that is alive today and probably will be alive, born in the next 20 years. The only beneficiary will be somebody who will be born in the year 2025 and beyond. It will be basically a male who is single.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) can talk about the impact of this on women.

It is a major study. We hope that people will look at it because it confirms the Galveston plan, which the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is so familiar with, in which they do private accounts. A GAO study showed that the Galveston plan is not working.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has some constituents that he is going to meet with now, but I appreciate his comments and his leadership.

I think the kind of participation that Mr. Mueller provides as an economist, as a Republican, is the very kind of Republican participation that we need. He conceded in his comments that he began with a strong ideological predisposition against our current Social Security system, but he was willing to let the facts overcome that ideological predisposition.

That is really what we are saying to some of our Republican colleagues who have made these very harsh criticisms of Social Security, to look at the facts; and when they show, as this study that the gentleman referred to, they show that no one alive in the world today would gain from wrecking the system and changing it so much that we would not recognize it, then we ought to try to improve the system rather than to reject it.

I appreciate the gentleman's participation.

I know that the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT), one of the few physicians here in the House, serving on the Medicare Commission as well as working on Social Security, has some insight on this issue as well.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is to be commended for having scheduled this the day that we passed the most irrelevant resolution that I can imagine. It was empty in all its aspects.

I would say to the gentleman from Texas, as I sit here and think about this, I was thinking about my grandfather. He was a second generation American who went to the second grade. He could read the newspaper and he could write, basically, but had no assets. But in the investment industry in the 1920s there was a guy named Samuel Insole who had the electrical industry all locked up, and he was selling stock all over the United States. This was the time when we had private retirement. Everybody had their own retirement. There was no Social Security. So someone saved their own money.

Well, Insole came down into central Illinois, where my grandfather was, selling this stock. My grandfather, no economist, no great education, said to his wife, if this stuff is so good why are they selling it in the cornfields of Illinois? Why don't they sell it in Chicago?

When it crashed and all the old people in this country had nothing, that is when Franklin Delano Roosevelt came with Social Security. Because when people tried to invest their own money in the stock market, some people made it and some people got clobbered.

So this has been a system now in place for 70-some years, I guess 60 years, that has basically been protecting senior citizens. When people come here talking about let us privatize it, let us get away from a situation where we all pay into the same pot and we take out as long as we live and we share the risk, all Americans share the risk together, the move in the Committee on Ways and Means now is, let us privatize it and give everybody a little book, and they will put their money in their little book, and they will know how much they have, and they can get rich or they can go in the ditch. That will be their choices. Who knows?

The model they use comes out of Chile. People in this country ought to take a very careful look at the Chilean example.

First of all, it took a dictator, Augusto Pinochet, to wipe out the system in Chile of a universal system and give everybody individual books. They had to wipe out the labor unions, and they ultimately set this system up.

Two years ago, when the stock market was not doing well, the Chilean government said to people, please do not retire because the stock market is down and people will not have enough to live on.

My view is that we ought to be creating a solid system that goes into the future and not go back to the 1920s in this country.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mrs. THURMAN. There is another fallacy within the Chilean issue and I think it is one that all of us are very comfortable with and one that certainly the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) has spoken about and that is, what happens to women and children, to this family issue? What happens to people who become disabled? If one looks at that system, there is in no way any kind of a benefit built into their system; where in ours we have a guaranteed benefit for those particular folks that find themselves in those very difficult situations.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MATSUI. If I may just indulge for a minute, I noticed that sitting in the Speaker's seat, as Speaker pro tempore for the day today, is a new colleague of ours, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE). Actually, he comes from the Sacramento area, as many of my colleagues know who have met him. He has just taken our distinguished colleague Vic Fazio's seat, who retired.

I would just like to acknowledge the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) and say that I am honored to be on the floor of the House in the gentleman's first opportunity, since he has been elected to the Congress, as Speaker pro tempore of the House. So I just wanted to say, and probably breaching some kind of rule here, but I just wanted to acknowledge the gentleman this evening and say I am very, very pleased that he is here and part of this. It is a very historic moment, obviously, for the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) and his family.

Mr. DOGGETT. We are pleased to have the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) presiding over us this afternoon. And we are going to keep talking to the gentleman and with the gentleman, because we do need everybody from California joining in to help us get Social Security legislation here, a piece of legislation that we can all be proud of that will be there for our retirees.

□ 1615

As the gentlewoman from Florida is pointing out, for what I believe is about 16.7 million children and adults here in the United States that are not relying on Social Security as the retirement system but it is absolutely vital to them that Social Security is there for people with disabilities or family members with disabilities.

I believe she was pointing out that it does not work that way under this great model that some of our colleagues have been advocating.

Mrs. THURMAN. The other thing that I might add to that is the issue of an independent business owner. About 80 percent of them are covered under no kind of retirement plan and were actually given an option not to participate at all. We have no clue or idea

what would happen if their business failed in some way when they reach that magical year of retirement for themselves, of what would happen to them. Would they become a ward of the country? What happens to this person?

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentlewoman is saying in Chile if we followed that model, there would be businesses in California, in Florida, in Texas that would be totally outside of the system.

Mrs. THURMAN. And that is exactly what happened in Chile. In fact, they said I think 80 percent of the small businesses in fact do not even participate. We do not know, as I said, if they have no income. I think that takes us right back to where we are and have been such strong supporters of Social Security, because when it was developed, it was specifically developed to lift people up and have some dignity in their retirement years. In this case we do not know where that dignity would be, which is why I would be very concerned. It is also happening in some of the other countries that we are seeing, with privatization, in the UK and in France and in some other areas where they are looking at 5 years, they could go bust in those areas and do not have a clue as to what they are going to do at this point, quite frankly because of administrative costs in these retirement issues.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I think there is one other thing that I want to emphasize. Sometimes you cannot say something too many times. That is, this whole disability business, because I have got an incident in my own district right now that is right in the middle of my mind. This is the best disability income program in the world. You cannot buy one any better than this. We had a policeman who was injured and subsequently died, 38 years old, a wife, kids 5 and 3. Now, they go into the Social Security system and she is guaranteed a benefit for herself and those children for the rest of her life and for the kids up to the age of 18. Most young people in this country do not know that they are walking around with this insurance policy in their pocket. It is not one you want to collect on but it is like your fire insurance. You buy fire insurance on your house hoping you will never collect on it. The same is true in terms of this. To make this appear that this is just a program for old people is simply to misrepresent what the Social Security system is all about.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me, if I might, just on that point quantify, because we had some excellent testimony the other day in our Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security from Marty Ford representing the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities. She pointed out that for the average wage earner, much as the gentleman was saying for the law enforcement officer, for the average wage earner with a family, Social Security that we have today, the insurance benefits, are the equivalent of a \$300,000 life insurance

policy or a \$200,000 disability insurance policy. I think that is the kind of benefit that we are talking about that many people, a small business owner of the type our colleague from Florida was mentioning, an individual employee could not go out and afford to buy that kind of policy. But with all of us working together in this government program, everyone gets that policy of disability insurance and of life insurance.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I think there is one other thing that the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) brought up and I think needs to be emphasized, and that is the effect on women. If you have individual accounts and you work and on the basis of your job you put in whatever percentage, most women in this society make less than men do.

Mrs. THURMAN. If the gentleman will yield, we make about 74 cents on a dollar as versus a male. However, I will say that during the State of the Union, it seemed to be one of the areas where there was a lot of bipartisan support, that we should have parity in the workforce. I am ready to work on that issue any time the gentleman is ready.

Mr. McDERMOTT. But there is another way in which women, if you have individual accounts, not only do they make less but they work less numbers of quarters, for reasons of childbirth and for reasons of staying home and taking care of family members. Generally men do not leave their job and take care of their mother or their father or their in-laws.

Mrs. THURMAN. The average is about 11 years less than what men work in the workforce.

Mr. McDERMOTT. And then women live longer. So they have less money as income, they have worked less number of years and then they live longer, so that they are impoverished or they will be impoverished by this kind of system.

Mrs. THURMAN. The way that that would work is they would have to buy under an individual account an annuity and when they buy that annuity it would be based on an actuarial life span. Because women are predicted to live longer, so when they bought theirs at 64, 65, whenever they were ready to retire, when the insurance folks would settle this out, they would say you would actually get a lesser per month check than the male would just because of your life span issue, which is the reason that that would happen.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Anybody who looks at this with an open mind realizes that women will suffer if we go to privatization and do not have this generalized program we have today. That reason alone ought to be enough to make us keep this program together, if we care about our mothers and our sisters and our aunts and all the rest.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentlewoman from Florida was at this briefing today with the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. The Republican economist who did

that simulation on these various privatization schemes, his conclusion was that no group in our society would be a bigger loser than women, and that it did not make any difference, well, it makes a difference in degree, I guess, but regardless of income class, regardless of race, regardless of marital status, because of the factors that the two of you have just been describing, women will lose more than any other part of our society if we reject the Social Security system that has served us so well and go off with some of these ideological experiments.

Mrs. THURMAN. If the gentleman will yield, just from the synopsis and summary of findings, it said women would be particularly affected by the loss of spousal and widows benefits, the lack of benefit progressivity, and the loss of unisex annuities provided under our Social Security system as we know it today. And the Social Security benefit for surviving widows is higher than the benefit widows would receive under a privatized system. This is true in married couples when the wife is college educated with even full earnings. So there are really some issues that would have to be particularly looked at.

I will say, even in the resolution that was passed today, women was an area that was considered under this and one of the things that I would like to say to my colleagues is that it is okay to put it in words but now let us make sure it turns into action and that we do not reduce these benefits or these concerns.

If the gentleman will let me just say something else, too, because this goes into another area but still I think is the whole idea of security in your retirement years and specifically with the issue of Medicare and the idea that we would add this additional 15 percent to take us into the year 2020. I think the gentleman from Texas mentioned the security of health care. In one of our same hearings, and I know we are not going to get much into this, but one of the things that was said during one of our committee hearings, Mr. Lew said basically if Congress fails to enact this legislation, 15 percent, we have only three options in the Medicare issue and I hope that we are all listening to this because he stated that we would have to reduce provider payments, raise payroll taxes or cut benefits. I am just adding that in because that is another part of the whole Social Security issue as we are looking at this debate.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I think one of the things that we need to talk about a little bit so people really understand it, because sometimes I know that I think I understand about something until I really begin to feel about or actually look at it. This Social Security issue really, if you want to take a point when it got acute was in 1983. We in the Congress, not any of us, but the Congress decided they were going to save Social Security, so they raised the contribution rate so that people were putting more money into the pot that was

being paid out in that year, the so-called pay-as-you-go idea. You put in as much as you have to pay out. Well, we were putting in more than we had to pay out, so a surplus developed in there. During the 1980s, under Mr. Reagan, for the Cold War reasons and a lot of reasons, we borrowed all of that. We borrowed that money out of the Social Security and we have been paying—we meaning the government borrowed it—and we have been paying interest. Every year, one dollar out of seven in the Federal budget goes to pay interest to the Social Security system. It is almost our biggest expenditure outside of Social Security itself, just a little less than we spend on defense, we are spending in interest on this money.

The President's proposal in his State of the Union message was absolutely a stroke of genius, because he is not only paying off the national deficit but he is also strengthening the Social Security system by putting 62 percent of the surplus until the year 2014, and the amount of national debt will be markedly reduced. I personally think that it is inconceivable that if you have any conservative bones anyplace in your body that you would, having received this benefit, say, well, let us spend it on a tax break rather than pay this enormous debt that faces this country. I think the people have to understand, the Congress created the debt, and it is now when we have surplus the time to pay it off. It is like your credit card. If you get a Christmas bonus and you say, well, let us just buy some more rather than paying down your credit card, you would say that person was irresponsible. The Congress will be irresponsible in my view if it does not use this money to pay down that debt.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is the whole meaning of the phrase "save Social Security first." We save Social Security first, ahead of anything else, and we do it by the very fiscally responsible step of paying down these trillions of dollars of Federal debt that has been accumulated over the last many decades.

Mrs. THURMAN. Again through the hearings that we have had, if anybody has been watching the news or reading the newspaper or looking at Newsweek or any one of the organizations that have been writing about what is going on up here, Greenspan both in the Senate Finance Committee and Ways and Means, Banking, wherever he has appeared over the last couple of months in his report to Congress has been, this is the best thing you can do for this country. And then the beneficiaries are all Americans, because we continue to see a robust economy with jobs being created, businesses having capital to expand and extend their businesses, we have lower interest rates or continued lower interest rates. We know how that has been spurring this economy, the fact that people have been able to refinance their mortgages so they have more money in their pockets for disposable income, maybe for possibly even putting a little money aside for

children to go to college or buy health care or help with long-term care for an elderly person, whatever that case may be. We all recognize that that is what we should be doing.

I have to tell you, it was interesting, I am going to try to get it right. This morning I was going back over some clips. It seemed that there was this continuing, "Well, if we don't do this, we've got all this surplus, should we then give this tax cut?" And Greenspan said, "Well, you know, it is the last thing I would like you to do, but the worst thing you need to do is be spending it on new programs. So if you can't save it and use it to pay down the debt, well, then maybe you should do that."

But quite frankly the first thing we should be doing with this money is paying down our debt.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The actual quote, if the gentlewoman will yield for a second, "My first preference," he said, "is to allow the surpluses to run for a while and unwind a good deal of the debt to the public which we have accumulated over the years." Here is the man that has brought in large measure the present economy to its present state. He is saying, pay off the debt. I do not see how anybody can be against this. It is going to be interesting to hear the debate that will go on while they try and justify, "Well, since we've got the money, rather than pay it off, we'll just give it back."

□ 1630

It is the people are the ones who are going to benefit from stabilizing Social Security and Medicare. There is a tie between these two. Because when we talk about these older women, there are about 6 million women in this country living on \$8,000 of Social Security, and it is those people that we are talking about raising the premiums on Medicare.

Mrs. THURMAN. Sixty percent of the Social Security recipients are women in this country.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Yes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me ask you in that regard from your service on the Medicare Commission. Now I have heard some people on our Committee on Ways and Means say that they, as Republicans, would agree with the President to set aside 60-62 percent of future surpluses to take care of Social Security, but they wanted the rest of it, I guess, for various other schemes, and they did not want to focus on the Medicare aspect. If we only do the 62 percent and we do not have any long-term solution otherwise to Social Security and we do not address Medicare, what would be the effect on the health security of our seniors?

Mr. McDERMOTT. Well, I think that, first of all, anybody who would try and separate them and say one is important and the other is not simply is not old, because if you are old, you think about two things: How you are going to pay for your house and your food and how you are going to pay for your doc-

tor bills. And when Medicare started, 1965, less than 50 percent of people had health insurance above the age of 65. Now 100 percent are covered. It is the second leg of the economic security for senior citizens in this country, and you have to stabilize that plan. Otherwise, the Social Security check is going to go simply to pay for more health care benefits.

Seniors already spend \$2,500 on average in this country out of pocket on Medicare for medical things that are not covered by Medicare. So the Social Security and the Medicare are linked very tightly, but it is absolutely crucial that people have an income to live on. If you do not have that one stabilized and you start making that one unstable and then make their health care unstable, you will have taken away all the emotional security that senior citizens feel in this country because of these two programs.

Mr. DOGGETT. A colleague of ours who was a leader even before coming to this House as a State official in dealing with pensions, retirement security, insurance, is EARL POMEROY of North Dakota. And I am pleased that you join us this afternoon, also now as the co-chair of our entire Democrat Caucus Task Force on Social Security, and I know you have some thoughts about this ongoing debate.

Mr. POMEROY. I certainly do, Congressman, and I want to thank you for your leadership as well as, Congressman McDERMOTT and Congresswoman THURMAN, for your leadership on the Committee on Ways and Means. I know that you have been having many hearings on this topic awaiting the reform proposal of the majority.

While it is difficult to try and see what they may be proposing, I know, as you have told me, the thrust of the debate seems to be shaping up to be between those that want to reform and reduce Social Security protections and those that want to strengthen and protect and extend those protections so that the next generation has the same protections that our parents, grandparents and we will have as well.

I think that, as we see this take focus, it appears as though those who want to reduce Social Security will be advancing a proposal of individual accounts replacing the guarantees and assurances that today protect one in six families in this country, one in six Americans in this country receiving a Social Security payment in exchange for an individual account proposal.

You have mentioned earlier a study that was released today, and I also want to call it to the attention of the body, a study authorized by the Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare conducted by a Republican economist that shows there are distinct winners and losers under a proposal to go to the individual account. But most of us, virtually all of us living today, fall in the losing category. The individual account winner fell to one narrow class of males in affluent

earnings that will be born in about 20 years. All of the rest of us lose, and we lose for one fundamental reason: You have to continue making payments on the existing structure, the structure that today is meeting the needs of more than 40 million Americans, even while you begin to create these individual accounts and direct money to those so that that is going to work to replace the Social Security payments in the future.

The thought behind this economist's study was a very simple but straightforward one. It is always, always more expensive to pay for retirement twice than once. And so if we fund the existing system and fund the individual account system, we are in essence paying twice, and that is the cost that ultimately reduces what Social Security offers to Americans.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. POMEROY, within that, and so we can kind of look at this debate and maybe kind of give the audience or whoever is out there listening to us the word or the captured word that what you are talking about, and this is the transition tax. It may be called something else, but the fact of the matter is it is the dollars that are going to have to be spent to cover those people that are on Social Security today and within the system.

Now to that, Mr. POMEROY, one of the things that John Mueller talked about specifically was these other studies and why these other studies were wrong when looking at the Social Security system, specifically as we privatize or if it were to be privatized. And they said that these are some of the issues that were left out of their models.

And maybe you can help me with this, that they have left out or underestimated transition costs, which would be this transition tax, and administrative fees for private accounts, that they have used a so-called typical household that in reality does not parallel the actual earnings or employment history of most workers. And, three, they have used exceptionally high projections for market returns that do not track with the extremely slow economic growth or cash used by the Social Security actuaries when we are predicting the future of Social Security funding.

Mr. POMEROY. That is precisely correct. The gentlewoman is exactly right. These earlier studies have been flawed, and they are being corrected by a spate of recent studies done by all perspectives out there analyzing this very important issue. I cite for the gentlewoman's attention a November, 1998, EBRI study.

Now EBRI is the Employee Benefits Research Institute, a business-funded research group assessing the impact of administrative fees on these individual accounts. The thrust of the study, quite likely the administrative fees certainly eclipse any enhanced earning opportunity under the individual account proposal, if they are administratively possible in the first place.

Mr. McDERMOTT. What is the administrative cost under Social Security? Do you know?

Mr. POMEROY. The administrative cost under Social Security is under 1 percent. It is truly the most efficient mechanism of getting benefits available to Americans.

Mr. McDERMOTT. And the administrative costs in an investment house, Wall Street Journal kind of private investment account, what would that be?

Mr. POMEROY. Well, they run considerably more than that. In fact, the least expensive individual account structure could be brought on line potentially for 8 percent, 800 times what we are presently paying; and a more likely scenario could be 30 to 40 percent in a completely privatized environment, reducing benefits in favor of administrative costs while you reduce the assurances. It is just not the way to go.

Mr. DOGGETT. And while the study that we heard about today was a simulation using an economic model by a Republican economist, is there not some experience in some of the foreign countries that have moved to these private systems that they have actually experienced administrative costs of the level that you are referring to?

Mr. POMEROY. Well, the fact of the matter is you are precisely right, and pensioners and near-to-be pensioners have lost millions, all told. In the experience of Chile, in the experience of the United Kingdom, two prevalent examples asserted by those that want to create individual accounts, look a little deeper and you see that the administrative expense component is really coming home to roost in those experiments.

The other real-life example we have is a private alternative to a Social Security program being run down in Galveston, Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. We usually think everything is a little bigger and better down in Texas, but in fact the study that you referred to in Galveston, Texas, most everybody there that was left out of Social Security. According to the objective study on it, they came out a looser; did they not?

Mr. POMEROY. Well, this is a study by the General Accounting Office, and this is not a group with any stake in this debate. They are providing the strict analysis, and they find precisely that those that have gone not with the Social Security but with this alternative plan for the local public employees have not fared as well as they would have done under Social Security.

As we approach this vitally important program, it is really important, because of its critical importance to American families, that we not deal with, you know, ideology and theories and concepts. If we would make this change, we would not be able to change back, and so it is vitally important that the research come up a good measure from what those favoring individual accounts are presently asserting.

For example, they say that African Americans would benefit under a move

to individual accounts. Today's study shows quite conclusively that African Americans would lose and lose big. They hold this out as an opportunity for modest income workers to accumulate wealth. Today's study shows that middle income, modest income workers lose and lose significantly, as opposed to the assurances they now have with Social Security. And then finally women, the biggest losers of all under the shift to individual accounts.

I look at the perspective from my own family. I cite the three women in my life: my 78-year-old mother, my 46-year-old wife and my 5-year-old daughter spanning three generations. All lose, moving away from the guarantees of our Social Security program into the untested uncertainties of the individual account environment. The study today shows it is a loser and we leave people less well off, with greater risk and lower benefits.

Clearly, this is absolutely not the way to go with a program as important to Social Security. I think at this point in time, if the majority wants to continue to pursue this radical reform proposal, reducing the assurances of Social Security in exchange for the individual account proposal, it is time for them to stop shooting at the framework advanced by President Clinton that preserves the guarantees and advances specific proposals that would establish the individual accounts. I am convinced, in light of what these studies have shown, that when analysis is run on any individual account proposal they will bring forward, we will show reduced benefits, higher risk, lower assurances and a step backwards in terms of providing retirement, income security for American families.

I thank the gentleman for this discussion.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Before you walk away, I would like to ask you a question. You quote that Galveston study. What were the reasons why people who choose not to go into Social Security but to do their own investing, why did they come out worse off? I mean, my son has given that argument to me. He said, dad, we do not need Social Security. Just give me my money, and I will invest it, and I will be just fine. I would like to hear what happened to them.

Mr. POMEROY. Well, in fact, they run into the things that we have been discussing, higher administrative fees, greater investment return uncertainty, the same things that would face, in fact, the reform of Social Security.

The fact of the matter is that I think we need to appreciate the fact that as individuals deal with at-work retirement plans, they are already taking on a good deal more risk than they traditionally have. In the past you had your pension, the assets were managed elsewhere, and you put in your time, and you got your retirement check.

Presently, you have a 401(k) plan. Workers in the work force today struggle to make a matching contribution

so they get some money accumulating in their 401(k) accounts. We know that over half the 401(k) accounts in the marketplace have less than \$10,000 in them, hardly anything that is going to sustain a comfortable retirement.

We also know that those 401(k) accounts carry a level of investment risk, and quite often workers are mystified, bewildered by the investment choices that confound them. The last thing they want to do is take the one piece of security they have in retirement, Social Security, the bedrock, the foundation, and put risk into the foundation as well.

□ 1645

This is what we build on for retirement security. We do not want to crack the bedrock assurances social security has offered, creating even more uncertainty as to the ability to make it in retirement years.

Mrs. THURMAN. One of the other things we have found, not maybe with the Galveston but just generally, particularly when we are using another form of an IRA 401(k), those kinds of issues, again, this comes back to women. In many cases, if they only work maybe 4.7 years at one job, therefore, for many companies they cannot even vest or participate in any kind of a retirement system outside of social security, which creates one problem for them.

Then say that they get into that situation and they do have an opportunity to vest in something like this, or they have put some money aside in an IRA. Women are the first ones that give up that security to give security to their other family members. So if they have a child that needs to go to school, it becomes an education benefit for their child. If maybe they need a house or a down payment, they are the first ones to give up that security that would be used for themselves in that later time of retirement. So again, here is another little pitfall that happens for women in these situations.

I think the one about the 4.7 years, so much of this is based on vesting in any one system. Sometimes it takes as much as 10 years. We just do not stay at a job for that period of time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I think EARL really put his finger on it. It is there and we know it is there, and our job has got to be to stabilize it and make it so that there is no question that it will be there for our kids.

I think all of us my age or around my age have kids who say, well, I heard that this is not going to be there when I get to be old. The first thing we have to get out to them is the message that if we did nothing, if we did nothing, there would be three-quarters of the benefits in social security forever. There is no question that we can do that. The question is whether we are going to have to reduce the benefits if we do not do something about it.

I think that the mythology of those people who want to privatize it and get

rid of the Federal program has been to say to our kids in an advertising campaign over and over again, social security is not going to be there when you get there, so why are you paying for it? You are paying in, but you are not going to get anything out of it, you know. That has begun to take effect among young people in this country, when in fact it is not true. It is a lie that is being pushed by people who want to destroy the social security system as we have come to know it.

I personally think our biggest job will be, and if we fail in educating the public about this, at some point they may buy this kind of mythology, about if they had their own money. But the thing we have to remember about the United States is that we are not a country which has done things individually. We do not put out fires individually. We do not build highways individually. We do not build schools individually. A social security system, some may be able to build one, but for everybody who can, there is going to be somebody who cannot. Our problem here is to make sure that everybody has something. Otherwise we will be back in the thirties.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a couple of points there that I think are really important, because I have gotten some of those same kinds of communications. I expect every Member has, particularly from younger Americans, saying, just show me the money and I will do it on my own.

One of the things we know from the study that came out today that we have referred to, prepared by a Republican economist who had a leading staff position with House Republicans in this House during the Reagan administration, is finding that every one of those people, the young person that wrote you, the young person that talked with you at a town meeting in Florida, the young person who contacted me in Austin, Texas, every one of those people and every single person alive today is going to come out worse under these experimental plans, according to this simulation, is going to come out worse than if we maintain and strengthen the system that we have right now.

Mr. McDERMOTT. How do people get that report? Where is that report?

Mr. DOGGETT. This report is available from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. I am sure they will have it up for many of our young people who are web literate on their website. I know my office will be pleased to supply information, and I am sure yours, as well, to people from your part of this country who want to get more information about how they would be affected.

Then I would just add, with reference to what you said about going back to the thirties, I have to feel that one of the reasons that some of these Washington think tank ideologues want to break apart the social security system is that they are so committed ideologi-

cally against anything that has government in it. They do not agree with the government highways, they certainly do not agree with government schools. They want to voucher some students out. They will not vouch for public education. They feel if they can tear apart the bonds that have tied Americans together around social security, then they can eliminate any government program.

I think it is that ideological fervor, it is the kind of thing I was referring to at the beginning of this special order in the Newt Gingrich Progress and Freedom Foundation, that it was not just about financial returns, but it was about some very distorted idea of freedom; that if you could break apart the social security system, you could break apart anything else.

I think when we stand up for social security, we are not only standing for the security of our seniors and our disabled Americans, but we are standing for some common bonds that tie us together; that I have an interest in what happens to your family, you have an interest in what happens to mine; in our retirement, if we are faced with the loss of a breadwinner, if we are faced with an unexpected disability, that there is something there to provide us with a little bit of a safety net in that kind of tragic situation.

I know the gentlewoman has some observations on this.

Mrs. THURMAN. I was just going to say, when the gentleman was talking about the young person and the report, if we go to page 11 of that report, and under conclusions, No. 2, and the gentleman from Washington can say this back to his son, because of the transition tax, and again, I go back to that, inherent in any move away from pay-as-you-go social security, no cohort now alive could avoid serious economic losses from partly or fully privatizing social security, even under the most unrealistic set of assumptions. All cohorts now living would be substantially better off with even a scaled-back, balanced, pay-as-you-go retirement program.

Mr. McDERMOTT. May I ask a question?

Mrs. THURMAN. Certainly.

Mr. McDERMOTT. What is a cohort?

Mrs. THURMAN. I would think that would be one of us; a people, a person.

Mr. McDERMOTT. A group, right?

Mrs. THURMAN. These are scientific terms they use when they are putting together these reports.

But also the question that has to go back to that young person today is, if they are relying on a study, they need to ask the hard question, too, because this is about their security. Just as important, it is about their mother's or father's security, so that that does not fall upon them when they have children and are trying to rear their children, and all of a sudden they have a parent who has no income, or any of those kinds of things that could happen to them.

But the hard questions go back to why the other studies are fundamentally flawed. Why were those questions not asked? Again, they left out the underestimated transition costs, they have used a so-called typical household, and the fact that they look at exceptionally high projections for market returns. Those are the questions we need to send back to our children.

I would also say, I am not giving up on our children, our sons and our daughters. They see the benefit to their parents or, in some cases, their grandparents. They understand that their parents are being able to pay for their education. They are able to help them buy that first home, because their parents' parents are not reliant on them for their everyday household needs. I think that that is very important.

So if we just let them kind of capture back in, look around and see the benefits social security has provided in their own family, in their own family today, and then look at friends who might have had a loss of a parent, or if they have had somebody who has been on disability at an early age, they can truly look and see what this program has provided. I hope we will continue to do these kinds of things, to continue to bring these issues to the American people.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) has been great, and I have enjoyed this, I say to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank both Members for their continuing work on this topic.

I would just summarize in these closing minutes and say that the first thing is to put social security first. We say, save social security first. Do not engage in a bunch of new spending programs. Do not dissipate the surplus with some politically-motivated changes in the tax code. Use the resources that are available at this great time in the American economy to see that social security is saved first.

Then second, it is a matter of our working towards a bipartisan agreement. I believe that we can do that in a constructive way. We must do that. We should move forward immediately with the President's program and see how we can make it even better to preserve this very valuable system.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK EARLE McCAMMOND, AN EAGLE SCOUT FROM CARTERET COUNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy time for young children in America. Mixed messages from our society about morality and the value of truth can confuse an already difficult time for our Nation's children.

When so many young people today are finding destructive means to cope

with everyday frustrations and concerns, I am proud to bring to Members' attention an outstanding young man from the Third District of North Carolina who has taken positive steps to ensure a bright future for himself and his community.

At just 14 years of age, Patrick Earle McCammond recently achieved the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. The Eagle Scout rank is the highest rank in scouting. In fact, only about 2.5 percent of Boy Scouts ever achieve Eagle Scout. It is an accomplishment reserved for young men who incorporate the principles in the Boy Scout oath and the Boy Scout motto in their daily lives, and earn 21 merit badges in areas ranging from community service and leadership to physical fitness. Patrick not only handled and met these standards, but he far surpassed the minimum requirements. In all, Patrick has earned a total of 55 merit badges, with more in the works. That is more than double what is required.

He has also received a number of honors and awards within Boy Scouts in his community, which include the Arrow of Light, World Conservation Award, International Catholic Awareness Medallion, and the High Adventure Patch.

While achieving this rank itself is an accomplishment, Patrick has literally dedicated his youth to helping his community. When I learned of Patrick's achievements at such a young age, I certainly was impressed. But only when I learned about a project he developed for his community did I fully recognize the impact of scouting on Patrick's life and his future.

One additional requirement for Eagle Scout is the completion of a service project to benefit a religious institution, school, or community. We have a strong military presence in North Carolina. In the Third District alone, which I have the privilege to represent, we have four military bases with 77,000 retired veterans and another 10,000 retired military. Knowing this, Patrick created a website designed to assist the veterans in his Carteret County community.

Mr. Speaker, there are many young men in the Third District of North Carolina like Patrick who have achieved the rank of Eagle Scout, and even more who will in the future. As their congressman, I am proud of each and every one.

What makes Patrick McCammond's efforts special to me is his concern for our veterans. No matter what age, we as a Nation must never forget the men and women who have served this Nation to protect the freedoms we enjoy today.

Patrick paid tribute by taking steps to research, create, and implement his project. First he worked with computer professionals and area veterans' organizations to develop the website, which he named carteretvets.org. He obtained technical and financial support from

local businesses in order to print informative guides he designed to publicize the website. He worked with his fellow scouts and classmates to check the site to ensure it was complete, and to check for flaws.

□ 1700

Finally, he led demonstrations to introduce his complete project to local veterans groups. Hundreds of veterans across the country have now visited and benefited from Patrick's web site.

Outside of his life as a member of the Boy Scouts, Patrick serves as the eighth grade class representative to his school student council at Annunciation Catholic School. He maintains a B average in his studies and is a state-level swimmer on the Carteret Currents swim team.

Patrick also serves as one of the 32 students who were selected from hundreds in the entire State of North Carolina to be a First Flight Ambassador for the Class of 2003, First Flight Centennial.

Mr. Speaker, in today's society it is easy to lose sight of the values of honor, integrity, and character, yet they are the foundations that make our citizens and our Nation strong.

I would like to thank the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Little League, and all programs and organizations within our communities that work to help teach our children values and help them to recognize their own potential.

Mr. Speaker, Patrick McCammond exemplifies all that is good in the youth of America today. I am proud of him and the example that he is setting for his peers by taking pride in his family, his faith, and his country. In his actions and in his deeds he, and all who participate in Scouting, reflect the values and spirit of community service that will build the future leaders who will make us all proud.

OBVIOUS BENEFITS OF A CONSERVATIVE, HUMANITARIAN APPROACH TO GOVERNING IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, before I start, let me just invite all of our colleagues who are watching and following the floor proceedings on the Republican side who have been looking forward to this evening's special order as an opportunity to showcase and feature a number of the successes of the Republican Conference here in Congress.

Our agenda is one, of course, of fighting for lower taxes, fighting for strong national defense, insisting that we find methods to secure and safeguard the Social Security Administration, and creating and providing the world's best education structure. I want to talk about the obvious benefits of a conservative, humanitarian approach to governing in America.

I want to do that, Mr. Speaker, by highlighting a couple of articles that appeared in the Denver Post over the last few days. Here is the headline: "Welfare rolls drop 42 percent. State's decline is faster than the U.S. average."

This is important to note because Colorado, among the 50 States, is considered a low-tax State. Colorado is a State where the regulatory burden on Colorado businesses and those who create job opportunities is relatively low. It is a State where we have been serious, quite serious about putting the welfare reform proposals passed by this Congress into place at the State level, and the result is very dramatic and very positive for the people of Colorado. Again, a 42 percent drop in the welfare caseloads over the last 18 months.

It is a real credit and a dramatic bit of evidence as to what can be achieved through lower taxation at the Federal level, lower regulation burdens on those who are creating jobs, and a healthy economy and business climate.

Mr. Speaker, here is a quote from one individual. He said that this is primarily due to employment opportunities and to a "work-first" model of welfare reform. This is a quote by Maynard Chapman, Welfare Reform Program Manager for the Colorado Department of Human Services.

"But if job opportunities are not out there, I don't care what type of welfare reform design you're using, it is not going to work because the job opportunities are not out there."

It highlights, that comment, what the Republican Party has been suggesting and promoting for a long time. That by focusing on a stronger, more vibrant economy we can structure welfare reform in a way that works, as it has for a woman named Teri Higgins who was quoted in the article.

Reform for her has meant a new way of life. After being on welfare for 3½ years, she is almost completely self-sufficient. She was a full-time student halfway through her associates degree program in business administration when welfare reform kicked in 2 years ago. Under the new system she had to work, so she decided to work in a work-study program at Community College of Denver. Within a year, the 37-year-old single mother of three boys went from being a welfare recipient to the office manager for the Division of Business and Government Studies at CCD.

Mr. Speaker, here is what she says. "What made the difference were the extra things," such as helping her provide for day care so she could go to school, the emotional support from counselors. She said that she still struggles. She makes a decent wage and it is hard to make ends meet, "but when I sit down and write checks out for all my bills and everything is paid, that is really a good feeling."

I suggest that for Teri Higgins, and for millions of people just like her, this pathway to self-sufficiency is the defi-

nition of liberty and freedom in America. It is made possible by the Republican majority in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate that, for the last 4 years that we have had the majority, heading into our fifth year, we have focused on tax relief. We have focused on families. We have focused on reducing the regulatory burden on those who provide the kind of jobs that Teri now enjoys. That, in the end, is by far a better definition of a caring, compassionate, humanitarian, conservative philosophy designed to put people first and help Americans help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me. I am especially interested in some of the definitions that tend to waft around inside the Beltway here, one being "compassion." I think, if one saw the New York Times last week, they saw an example of this. The noted commentator and columnist, Tony Snow, mentioned it this past Sunday on Fox News Sunday when a front page article in the New York Times bemoaned the reduction in applications for food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply affirm that the truest form of compassion is not adding people to the welfare rolls, not adding people to the food stamps program. The true definition of compassion is helping those people, just as the gentleman from Colorado mentioned, move from welfare to work so that they have the opportunity to provide for themselves and their families, so that they have the chance to realize their hopes and their dreams. That is the true measure of compassion.

Mr. Speaker, I must also note with great interest some of the comments in the preceding hour. It is sad to hear some come to this floor and so passionately try to sell an agenda of fear to the American public, rather than facts, to merchant or to market the politics of fear as opposed to the policies of hope.

Mr. Speaker, this common-sense conservative majority, in the tradition of welfare reform, is moving four major goals:

Number one, to protect, save and improve Social Security and Medicare.

Number two, to offer meaningful tax relief for working Americans.

Number three, to improve education, not by micromanagement from Washington bureaucrats but by empowering parents and students and teachers and local school districts.

And, number four, to strengthen our national defense and security.

Indeed, I was walking over with a constituent, a man who lives in Winslow, Arizona, part of the Guard and Reserves and also a Federal employee. He was telling me on the way over to this Chamber how he and his wife embrace the notion of lower taxes for everyone because they do not want to see some-

one punished for succeeding. They understand that as they will experience this year, with a child under 17 still at home, a \$400 per child tax credit. That \$400 stays in their pocket to save, spend, or invest as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, that is the challenge, is it not? Is there not a central choice here? Who do we trust, Washington bureaucrats or our family, to make decisions? That is the key and that is what we champion in this common-sense majority.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see another of our colleagues, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), one of our newcomers. I welcome him to the Chamber. We are glad that he is here.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, my friend and colleague, for yielding to me. I certainly concur with the remarks that have been made to date with regard to the issue of taxation, the impact it has on the country, the effect it has on productivity, the ability for this Nation to move ahead, to create jobs, to create wealth.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that whatever we tax, we get less of; whatever we subsidize, we get more of. The fact is that when we tax productivity, when we tax jobs, we are going to get less of them. It is not, as they say, "rocket science" to realize that this is the effect of overtaxation.

We are now at a rate of taxation in this country that has never before been seen. Many people do not realize that because times are good. We hear it all the time: Times are good. And so there is an assumption that if everybody is employed, that everybody enjoys paying a high level of taxes just because they have a job.

But, Mr. Speaker, they do not. As a matter of fact, even those people who are employed and making good wages deserve a tax break, deserve a tax reduction. Even those people who are on farms and who have spent a lifetime investing in the land and bring food to our tables, those people need a tax break. Those people need to have the abolishment of the inheritance tax. This is something that this Republican Congress is going to put forward. It is one of the many issues that we will drive forward to attempt once again to bring into line this Federal Government that is, in fact, oppressive enough to actually raise almost 20 percent of the GDP now going to taxes. Most families in this country are paying upwards of 40 percent of their income in taxes.

I cannot believe that there are people even here in this body, but certainly on that side of the aisle, who would suggest that that is anything even remotely near fair. There is nothing fair about taking 40 cents out of every single dollar that a man or woman working in this Nation makes and giving it to the government. There is nothing fair out of that. We do not get that much out of it.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, when we listen to our constituents, as the

gentleman from Arizona mentioned a little earlier, our constituents will tell us and help us to understand how important this issue is. I want to share with my colleagues a letter I received from a woman in Fort Morgan, Colorado. She said, "Since Republicans gained control of the House and Senate in 1994, my husband and I have been eagerly looking forward to some kind of tax reduction." And she said this January she is going to be retiring early. Her biggest concern, number one urgent need, is further tax relief to allow her and her husband to do some better financial planning and to deal with the situation that is about to change in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I brought a stack of letters from constituents back home and over and over and over again these constituents tell us that the upwards of 40 percent of taxes, when we consider the Federal, State and local taxes and when we consider the cost of regulation on top of that, the cost of being an American citizen is well over 50 percent of income. By no one's definition can that be regarded as being fair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) who has joined us.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we get some of the same letters. I have a letter from a woman in Savannah, Georgia. "Dear Mr. Kingston, I recently heard you say how much taxes have increased since the 1950s. Can you give me those statistics again? I am a homemaker in Savannah, Georgia, with four children and would greatly appreciate the ability of our family to keep more of its hard-earned money. Signed, Elizabeth Morris."

The income tax burden in the 1950s, as the gentleman from Arizona knows well, being on the Committee on Ways and Means, was 5 percent. In the 1970s when we were growing up, most of us in this room, it was 16 percent. Today it is 24 percent.

That is just the income tax. That is not talking about the property taxes and all the other incurred taxes that our constituents and hard-working middle-class people have to pay. But the reality is the higher our tax burden, the less time we have to spend with our family, with our children imparting values, teaching them the work ethic, teaching them right from wrong, because that second income in the family often is going to pay for Uncle Sam and our excesses.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a point that needs to be brought home is something borrowing from the gentleman from Colorado who talked about the percentage of our gross domestic product that now goes to taxation. Though I fear, Mr. Speaker, from time to time that is a very salient point and factually correct, sometimes we need to translate that into everyday language by offering other examples, and the gentleman from Georgia has done so.

I would say it this way, borrowing from my other colleague from Colo-

rado: There has come to be in this Nation an observance of a day that is not exactly a holiday, though it offers emancipation from the burden of taxation.

□ 1715

We call it tax freedom day. Depending on the calculation, whether we are talking exclusively about Federal taxes or if we combine them all, as the gentleman from Colorado pointed out, the cost of all taxation and the hidden costs of regulation, quite often, American citizens work from January 1 through our Independence Day or close to it on an annual basis to free themselves from the yoke of taxation. That is what we are talking about here.

These deal with flesh and blood human beings who are facing decisions, who, oft times, in a household, we will see both parents working, not by choice but by necessity, as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, points out, because one spouse is working essentially to continue to pay and satisfy the gaping wall of taxation.

It is a very simple concept here. One works hard for the money one earns. One should hang onto more of it and send less of it here to Washington, D.C., because now we find ourselves in the day of an overcharge. We are overcharging for government services.

When money hangs around the Federal Treasury, it is kind of like cookies in the jar in the Hayworth household. Somehow somebody gets to it. In the case of the money, it is spent by bureaucrats. As the attorneys would say, there is a preponderance of physical evidence to say what happens to the cookies in the cookie jar and who might get them from time to time.

So what we again must embrace is this notion of broad-based tax reform. Despite the calls of those who would offer the politic of fear, we embrace the policies of hope when we say that every American who succeeds ought to have the opportunity to hang on to more of what he or she earns and send less of it to the Federal Government; and understand that those who have succeeded through their investment, through their risk taking, if you will, in the marketplace, create jobs and create more opportunity and help to fuel an economic boom.

So that is what we champion here, along with our three other pillars of policy in the 106th Congress, to strengthen and protect Medicare, to improve education by empowering parents and local communities and, thirdly, to improve and bolster our national defense.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, our new colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), has been sworn in for a little less than 2 months; and I am curious, what has his constituents been telling him? Has he been hearing about the issue of taxes in the short time that he has been a Member of Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI).

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been hearing a great deal. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that I can put it more succinctly or more profoundly than a constituent from Aurora who writes, "The American dream has always been to get married and raise a family, to own your own business, to own your own farm, to build a secure and better future for your children to enjoy, to pass on what you have worked so hard for and paid taxes along the way for the next generation."

"For the past 20 years, I have successfully built several dealerships, providing jobs and revenue to several communities. These past years, I have given my all to build and make a secure future for my heirs. This can all be taken away from them if I should die and they should have to pay 55 percent on the estate. Would they have to liquidate or sell to be able to pay the estate tax? What would happen to everything that I worked so hard to provide for them? I support the estate tax reform so that not just me but all who have worked hard and built a nest egg for the future generation can keep it, not the government."

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, again, a profound communication from a constituent who understands fully the implications of this. I recognize that, for years, the idea behind an estate tax or let us call it what it is, it is a death tax, the idea behind that, it is a class envy thing, to a certain extent, where people felt, well, if people amass too much, we should actually just take it away from them and divvy it up again; that is only fair. Well, it is not fair. Again, this idea of fairness, to whom is it fair? It is not fair to this gentleman. It is not fair to his family.

Another thing, if one cannot accumulate for oneself and for one's heirs, for whom will one accumulate? The government? Would we be expecting the people in this country to go out and work day in and day out, again, creating real value, something the government knows very well about the actual creation of value? Do we expect John and Jane Q. Citizen to go out every single day to do that, only to give it away upon their death so they cannot pass it on to their heirs? No, of course not.

This is as socialistic a tax as we have in this country, and it should be done away with; as well as all tax reform efforts I think on the part of this Congress should move forward dramatically.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for one question. The common misconception by the liberals on the House floor when we debate reductions in the death tax or the inheritance tax is that this is a tax that one only needs to be concerned about if one is extraordinarily wealthy. But the inheritance tax applies to anyone who has parents and who is part of a will or a trust or estate. It is virtually every American.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) agree with me that this is a tax that every single American ought to be concerned about?

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a tax that every American should be concerned about. Not only that, the idea that the only people who pay it are the wealthy, I mean, go and look at the farmers of America today. Find me, this wealthy farmer out there who has wealth, as I say, yes, he has got wealth in the land, but it is just in the land. In order to transfer that wealth into true, hard, honest dollars, he has to dispose of it or his heirs do in order to pay this tax.

So it is bogus to suggest it is Daddy Warbucks, as the liberals and the Democrats want to suggest. That is the kind of picture they want to conjure up when we talk about eliminating the inheritance tax or the death tax. Well, it is not. It is the family farmers in Kansas and Colorado and Oklahoma and throughout this land that work every single day to put food on our tables. So my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), is absolutely right in that respect.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, just to bring home the point again, mindful of the letters the gentleman brought from constituents, and as pleased as I am, Mr. Speaker, that one of my constituents from Winslow, Arizona, joined me on the stroll over, this topic of death taxes came up at a town hall meeting last year in Winslow, Arizona. As our schedule worked out, this was a noon-time meeting.

One of the great satisfactions of this incredible honor of serving in the Congress of the United States is we meet so many people who want to make a difference. Two young men had gotten an excuse from school on their lunch hour, an early dismissal, to come to the town hall. These two young men had aspirations of attending one of our military academies.

They came, and they heard some of the seniors and other citizens in the room discussing just what my colleagues have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this incredible unfairness of the death tax. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it was reminiscent of the franchise that Art Linkletter used with such great effect over the years, "Kids say the darnedest things."

Here was this young man standing there just at the height of his youth and enthusiasm and wanting to do the right thing and wanting to join the military. He stood there ramrod straight and said, "Congressman, sir, do you mean to tell me the Federal Government taxes you when you die?" And there was laughter, just as this response comes. But as I reminded the citizens assembled, it really was not funny.

My colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), was quoted in the Wall Street Journal during his

first term who evoked memories of our early colonial days when he said of the death tax, "No taxation without representation." That particular observation has stuck with me.

But, Mr. Speaker, it goes further than that. Understand that this tax is so oppressive and our mission as a constitutional republic has gone so far afield. Remember what Benjamin Franklin wrote in Poor Richard's Almanac, "There are only two certainties in this life: death and taxes."

But even Dr. Franklin with his tax and his ability to invent and to almost see into time and foretell the future, even Dr. Franklin would be shocked to come back to this constitutional republic that he helped to found, and his reaction would be much like the reaction of the young man. Do you mean to tell me this government taxes you when you die?

We have seen it in our districts, in our States, across the country. Energetic enterprises, businesses that are not huge conglomerates but family-owned businesses, whether on Main Street or on the ranch or on the farm, those businesses broken apart, the assets sold, to satisfy or try to satisfy this most egregious tax that reaches in even to the grave to rob those who have accomplished.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned young people, mentioned those who are trying to establish businesses. My colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), mentioned farmers and ranchers, that literally every American is affected by the inheritance taxes.

I want to share with my colleagues another letter that I received just a few weeks ago. This was sent as a Mailogram, as it was addressed to me. It says, "The administration's 2000 budget plan presented to Congress on February 1 imposes new taxes that will make it harder for millions of American families to save for their own retirement needs and will seriously jeopardize the financial protection of families and businesses."

The writer goes on, and this is a writer from Loveland, Colorado in my district, "Providing for retirement and securing your family's financial security should not be a, quote, taxing experience. Americans are taking more responsibility for their own financial futures, and they have made it clear that they oppose both direct and indirect tax bites that jeopardize their retirement security and their ability to protect their families. Congress on a bipartisan basis soundly rejected a similar approach last year."

I will interject, it is true that the President, under the administration's budget, proposed a litany of new taxes on the American people, which the Republican Congress was fortunately here to prevent.

He goes on, "And I strongly urge you to do the same this time around. Please oppose any new direct or indirect taxes."

At a time when the Federal Government confiscates upwards of 40 percent of an average family's income, it is almost incomprehensible that, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, they are conjuring up new plans for the 2000 budget to raise approximately 73 new taxes, new taxes on businesses, on farmers, ranchers, on financial institutions.

In the end, what it does is it takes away the liberty and freedom and the success that is being discovered throughout the country in States like Colorado where we are seeing again headlines like this, "Welfare Rolls Drop 42 Percent."

The reason those welfare rolls are dropping is because Colorado in this case is a State with relatively low State taxes with a very high regard for a favorable and growing business climate. These high taxes rob the American people of opportunity. They rob average families from the ability, from the assets necessary to do the simple things in life, like raise a family and keep a roof over your head and put food on the table.

It makes it virtually impossible for the entrepreneurs to fully captivate and capture the great American spirit of self-sufficiency, not only to provide for themselves through an economic enterprise, but to provide jobs for others who need them, jobs like those that I mentioned that used to be welfare recipients who are now self-sufficient. That is really what is at stake.

The tax debate in Congress is not about simply cutting taxes or trying to win elections on the basis of tax reform. The tax relief debate is about real people, about real Americans, real farmers and ranchers who are struggling today, real business owners who are trying to provide more jobs and allow for more people to escape welfare. It is about the children of these families who deserve the same kind of America that we all enjoy and rally around.

That is what this tax debate is about. It is a very personal, humanitarian debate. It is one that we need to win. We do need to stand in the way of those people over in the executive branch of government who think this is the perfect year to raise more taxes, new taxes on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI).

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, it is so true that the perception that is held by so many people, even here in this town, certainly on the other side of the aisle and over at the White House, is that the country will actually not only survive another tax increase but we can get away with it because, again, as I say, times are good. Somehow this blanks out everything else.

We assume that we can then start promising everything to everybody again. We can come up with how many hundred programs were mentioned, how many hundreds of billions of dollars of expenditures were suggested by

the President in his budget? All of this, with keeping a straight face and suggesting that we are not going to, quote, bust the budget; we are going to maintain an agreement.

Of course, the only way that he could possibly make that statement, Mr. Speaker, the only way is because he was able to play a shell game with the Social Security issue. He was able to suggest that we could take, as he says, 62 percent, the President of the United States in his State of the Union message, and since then has suggested that we could take 62 percent of the "Social Security surplus," apply it toward Social Security and, somehow or other, that would solve our problem; and that would allow for, of course, us to do other things. It would create other programs.

Well, we know why, my friends, is because if we are talking about not correcting and not reforming the Social Security system, if we are talking about not actually building a firewall between the Social Security fund and the rest of the government expenditures, then we can do it.

□ 1730

Because what he is really suggesting is an increase over whatever 62 percent represents of this "surplus", however much money that is. That is what he is suggesting he is going to do to increase the Social Security debt. Because it is truly debt. It is not money.

When our friends and neighbors pay money to the government, when they send in their FICA taxes, they think they are actually putting money in a bank. That is the thought, because it is a fund. It is called the Social Security fund. Well, that is not it at all. There is nothing in the fund. There are no dollars in the fund. There are \$750 billion worth of papers stamped nonnegotiable bonds. That is the only place an instrument like that is in use in this whole Nation. Nonnegotiable bonds.

Well, what the President is suggesting is that he is going to correct this by adding 62 percent of the surplus to that debt, to those nonnegotiable bonds, and take the actual revenues, bringing it into the general fund again and creating more new programs. It is a shell game. But he is masterful at it, there are no two ways about it.

So I suggest to my colleagues that we should clear up this issue and we should bring to the attention of the American public the facts regarding Social Security and tax reduction. We should, in fact, create that fire wall between the Social Security fund and the general fund, and we should still move, I think quickly and dramatically, toward tax reduction and reform.

Mr. HAYWORTH. My colleague makes a very, very good point. It has been echoed by several economists and several columnists. Indeed, Robert J. Samuelson in this town talks about the double counting.

We have dealt so much for so long on so many topics, sadly, in an atmos-

phere of doublespeak from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Indeed, my colleague from Colorado, perhaps unintentionally, was describing quite accurately the feeling of many Americans when he used the phrase "get away with it", an abdication of responsibility so breathtaking and shocking not only in terms of personal conduct but also in terms, Mr. Speaker, of the sacred trust which we assume as constitutional officers.

Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder to see some who come to this chamber, as did our President for his State of the Union message, and stand at the podium behind me here. I took my own copious notes, and by my count the President proposed 80 new programs, 80 new programs, in the span of 77 minutes. And now, when our friends put a sharp pencil to paper and check the very real cost of those programs, to really pay for those programs we must have close to 80 new taxes or fee increases. And yet those who would tell us that they would guard the surplus, that they somehow are true guardians of the public trust, are engaged, in fact, in double count and doublespeak.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we heard it in this very chamber in the hour preceding this one, when those who look for shortcuts to political advantage continue to market and play upon the politics of fear rather than the policies of truth and hope. That is what we hear, Mr. Speaker, even in the wake of today's passage of a bipartisan resolution recommitting this Congress to the safety and sanctity of Social Security. We had one gentleman from Texas come to this floor and, in essence, say that Social Security was going to be destroyed. How sad and how false.

We have a responsibility to our constituents who have called upon us to represent them, to govern, because we have been selected by the people and for the people. And, oh, how I yearn for straight talk and taking a look and making the tough decisions. Because as I said in this chamber earlier today, Mr. Speaker, we cannot approach this as Republicans or as Democrats but as Americans to solve this problem. And yet the temptation of political advantage and the siren song of notoriety inside the beltway tends to propel others in these very partisan directions.

Let us at long last, Mr. Speaker, call for truth in personal conduct and in leveling with the American people both on matters of demeanor and policies of government. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear the Vice President of the United States say to the assembled press corps 1 year ago, "My legal counsel informs me there is no controlling legal authority." I think the Vice President was wrong. There is a controlling legal authority. It is called the Constitution of the United States.

And, moreover, there is a compelling and controlling moral authority, and it is called the oath of office that each of us take. And how those succumb to

temptations to "get away with it", whatever "it" may be, is both galling and not to be easily understood; and, in the final analysis, reprehensible, because it ignores and it counterfeits the sacred trust that citizens have placed in us.

That is the challenge we face; not to be facile and glib and get away with it, but to be about the business of the people; not to fly from place to place for campaign-like rallies, but to join with us and govern; and not to double count or double deal or doublespeak, but to work out legitimate differences and speak as best we can with one voice to confront these problems. These are the challenges we face.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, these unfortunate strategies that the gentleman has described that we typically see coming out of the White House are really emblematic of, I think, what the White House realizes the American people want to see, what they want to hear, and what they intuitively know and believe, and that is the belief that a large Federal Government is inherently bad for the American society. So they do go through all of these machinations and smoke and mirror strategies to try to mask and conceal what it is they really are pushing for and pushing toward.

The bottom line is their vision for America is a larger Federal Government that defines a society. Our vision as a Republican majority is for a smaller Federal Government and a greater American people. And I say a greater American people in the context of what the budget debate in this Congress is generally all about.

Thomas Jefferson said that there will always be two prevailing parties in a political system, the side that believes that we organize ourselves around a central government structure and there is the other side that believes that we organize ourselves around the strength of individuals. Those two parties are alive and well today.

The Democrat party that the gentleman described is one that is using remarkable linguistic gymnastics to double count imaginary money to suggest we should feel safe and secure that the government is not growing, when, in fact, it is growing by leaps and bounds. The national debt continues to grow on a year-by-year basis.

Our mission as a Republican Party is precisely the opposite. We want to invest the public's wealth in appropriate ways. We believe, however, that that wealth is better invested with the people who earn it. We want to shrink the amount of cash that makes its way to Washington, D.C., thereby strengthening the amount of cash that stays in the pockets of the American families, the American farmers, the American business men and women who work hard every day, who are the true individuals who define what it means to be an American.

In the end, we care about saving and rescuing the Social Security System

and rescuing the Medicare trust fund. We care about a strong national defense and having world class schools second to none. In order to do that, we can raise the resources necessary to accomplish these goals by focusing on economic growth, not a growth in the tax rate. And that is a key distinction and a key difference.

I notice the gentleman from Georgia is here, and I will yield the floor to him.

Mr. KINGSTON. I have a letter that somewhat ties into this, and I wanted to bring it up. It is from Mr. Jones Taylor of Saint Simons Island, Georgia, and he just says, paraphrasing here, that "I was disappointed in the Republican lack of agenda during 1998. Are you guys going to do that again or what is your agenda?"

I can say very easily what my agenda is, and I regret that I have not been here the whole time, so my colleagues may have discussed it, but I call it the BEST military, health care and agriculture: "B" for balancing the budget and paying down the debt; "E" for excellence in education; "S" for saving Social Security; "T" for lowering taxes. A strong military, a health care system that is affordable and accessible and a safe and abundant food supply.

Now, in that context, the gentleman mentioned stimulating the economy. One of the great ways to do that, of course, is to pay down the debt. We pay down the debt and then the big bear, the big monster in the interest market, in the borrowing market, the Federal Government, takes a smaller percentage of the interest out there. And that is a great way to stimulate the economy.

And if we do have a strong economy, revenues to the Federal Government go up and we will have a lot of money for expanding and strengthening our military, to increase the pay for our hard working soldiers, and, of course, to give the teachers in the classroom the educational funds that they need, and to shore up Social Security and Medicare. BEST military, health care and agriculture. That is a very solid agenda.

I know in each area of the country there are different things that we can emphasize. Agriculture in Colorado will be a little different than agriculture in Georgia, but the fundamentals of having a safe and abundant food supply is just as important in Colorado or Arizona as it is in Georgia.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Does the gentleman from Colorado have anything else to add?

Mr. TANCREDO. Well, I would just say that I have learned a lot of things in this last month and a half from my experience here in the Congress, and I must tell my colleagues that one of the scariest realizations that I have come to is that there is the possibility that there are, I do not know, certainly a large number, maybe a majority of the people even in this body who believe

that, in fact, the government is not big enough; that, in fact, we have not paid enough taxes and that we need to pay more.

I keep thinking to myself that either I am certainly out of touch or the rest of these people are. My colleague from Colorado knows, because we have spoken to some of the same groups, I can go home and there is a group called the Jefferson County Men's Club and there is the Arapaho County Men's Club, and I always think to myself when I hear people say things like this, that taxes are not high enough, that government is not big enough, I think how would this play in front of the Jefferson County Men's Club or the Arapaho County Men's Club? What would they say if I came back to them and said there are a lot of people there who think government is not big enough and ask them what they think. I can tell my colleagues I know what they would say; that we are out of our minds. And sometimes it sounds like it.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Let me once again, Mr. Speaker, bring this issue to the perspective of those who are not business owners, who are not those who enjoy extravagant wealth, but every day Americans who are struggling hard to make ends meet.

Once again I use the State of Colorado as an example: A low-tax State. A small government State. Here is another news article from my State that is just a couple days old. It says, "The boom boosts fringe: Transients among many landing jobs. Colorado's booming job market has given a boost to those who historically have lived on the outskirts of the economy, from the homeless veterans to the working poor. Clients of the Salvation Army, the Harbor Program", which is in downtown Denver, "are landing jobs above minimum wage." That is according to the resident manager Mark Garramone. Here is a quote from him. He says, "As a matter of fact, they are finding a lot of good jobs." He says, "Among those jobs cited were car salesmen, chauffeur, a few work at U.S. West." At the Department of Veterans Affairs, listen to this, here is a quote, "We placed in jobs the highest number of veterans in 1998 that we have ever placed." That according to Greg Bittle, Chief of the VA's Regional Office for Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling. He says, "In fact, the booming economy tends to pull people away. We are basically a training and education program, and the economy has been so robust that we will have vets drop out of school to take jobs." It just goes on and on.

□ 1745

Here is another example that was mentioned in here. Laurie Harvey, Executive Director of the Center for Women's Employment and Education, I went and visited this facility in Denver 2 years ago. It places low-income women, largely from the welfare rolls, in jobs. They say that so many of Colo-

rado's welfare recipients have moved off the rolls and into employment that her nonprofit is now seeing more and more people who are harder to serve.

So when it comes to public assistance for those who are looking for employment, we are narrowing our focus to those who have the legitimate needs for some kind of assistance, whether it is some kind of disability or handicap or whatever the case is.

It even goes beyond that. Listen to this last quote I will mention. It says, I would say there is probably a shortage of entry level labor. This is from Timothy Hall, chief executive officer for Larinden, which trains and places developmentally challenged people. He says, it is easier to convince employers to hire people with disabilities.

Low taxes, low regulation, small government in a State like Colorado is the model that we ought to look toward here at the Federal Government. The model of Colorado is putting people back to work who are veterans, those who suffer from disabilities, those who have been on welfare for years and years and years, those who are clients of the Salvation Army. Charity after charity after charity is celebrating the positive benefits of a strong, vibrant economy accomplished through smaller government, lower taxation, less regulation and more attention to growing a prosperous economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just follow the observation and say it is my honor to serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means; and our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), currently chairs the Subcommittee on Social Security but in the 104th Congress it was his job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources to put in place welfare reform.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I cannot help but remember that essentially the same welfare reform package intact was passed once by this Congress and vetoed by the President; again by this Congress and vetoed by the President; and finally, when it was sent the third time, as we understand from press accounts, one of the President's political consultants used the baseball analogy, saying, Mr. President, you do not want three strikes and you are out; sign this legislation.

I appreciate the fact and indeed, Mr. Speaker, we all know from our civics class, that we enact laws, but the President must execute his signature to see those laws implemented. So we welcomed at long last his signature. This is an example of a contentious challenge that was met head-on even in the atmosphere of contention in that 104th Congress to bring about a desired change, to now where we can measure compassion by a more accurate barometer by the number of people who voluntarily leave the welfare rolls in favor

of work; by the news that there are fewer applicants for food stamps because people are becoming self-sufficient.

Again understand, we make no pretense of ripping away the social safety net, but welfare reform helps prevent that safety net from turning into a hammock. That is what we have accomplished on both sides of the aisle. And that spirit, that example, should serve us well as we deal with this very difficult question of Social Security reform. How do we best save it? How do we maximize opportunities for all of our citizens, regardless of their age or their station in life?

Mr. SCHAFFER. In our remaining few minutes, I want to really talk about the importance of communicating with Members of Congress. The four of us who are here tonight I think are very representative of the Republican majority Members who serve in the House of Representatives. We rely heavily on the letters and phone calls from constituents, those who show up at the town meetings and find ways to communicate with their Members of Congress directly.

Those kinds of letters, phone calls and communications from constituents really arm us, as Members, with the real-life examples that are necessary to take on the party of the large bureaucracy, take on the White House and those who believe that, in a year like this, that higher taxes, for example, is a good idea. It is letters from constituents that tell us and remind us every day that bigger government is a thing of the past.

Let me use one more example from my district. This is under the letterhead of Tri-City Sprinkler and Landscape. It is from Loveland, Colorado. It says, Dear Representative Schaffer, I am your constituent from Loveland. As a business owner and grandparent, I am very concerned about the serious economic problems facing our country. I feel our current income tax structure is having a very negative impact by taxing production, savings and investment, the very things which can make our economy strong. Therefore, I support replacing the income tax and the IRS with a national consumption tax such as suggested in H.R. 2001, the National Retail Sales Tax Act. I urge you and your staff to look into it and co-sponsor it. Please let me know where you stand on this important matter.

I will write back to the constituent and give her my opinions and thoughts on that. I mention this letter and others that we have gone through tonight just to let the American people know that this government does not belong to the President. This government does not belong to any single Member of Congress. It does not belong to the Supreme Court. It belongs to the people just like the woman who wrote this letter, just like the people who write all of these other letters, and we really do rely on their advice and their assistance and their help in helping make

the case on behalf of individual Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) the remaining few minutes that we have left.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN. I would like to mention when the gentleman talks about the issue of tax reform and going to a simpler and fairer tax system, Newsweek Magazine a few months ago on its cover had a story, a cover story about the IRS; and it said, The IRS: Lawless, Abusive, Out of Control.

When any major department or agency of the Federal Government can be described by a mainstream magazine like Newsweek as lawless, abusive and out of control, things have gotten to a pretty sad state. It is especially sad when an agency as intrusive as the Internal Revenue Service can be accurately described in that way. So I think we basically should just take the Internal Revenue Code that we have now and junk it and start over again. I think about 85 or 90 percent of the American people feel that way.

Mr. SCHAFFER. On the matter of constituent input, how helpful do you find that representing your district in Tennessee?

Mr. DUNCAN. I find it very helpful. For those who think that we have cut taxes too much, a few years ago we had a \$90 billion tax cut spread over 5 years because that was the most we could get through at that time. Some of the more liberal Members kicked and screamed about that, but that was spread over 5 years.

That was a tax cut of slightly less than 1 percent of Federal revenues over that 5-year period. Now the average person pays about 40 percent of his or her income in taxes and another 10 percent in government regulatory costs, at a minimum. So today you have one spouse working to support the government while the other spouse works to support the family.

I know the President said in Buffalo that he could not support a tax decrease because the American people would not spend it wisely. I can say I think they would spend it much more wisely than this wasteful, inefficient Federal Government that we have today.

Mr. KINGSTON. Following up on the comments of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), it is amazing that the President would say that the hard-working people who earn the money cannot spend it as well as some of the people here in Washington, maybe including the four of us. But I can say one thing. I believe people can spend their money better than we can spend their money.

The tax cut that you alluded to last year, it was an \$18 billion tax cut for one year; \$18 billion out of a \$1.7 trillion budget. It was just a slither of a slither in this huge \$1.7 trillion pot, and it was killed by the Senate.

Now, the Senate and the White House ganged up on the House to kill the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act, and I think that it is ridiculous to have that kind of obstruction to doing something that is common sense for the tax system. I hope this year that if we pass it that the other body will find their senses and quit siding with the liberal White House on everything and act like conservatives and pass tax reductions.

Mr. SCHAFFER. In the remaining minute, I would ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), is there anything he can do to dramatize the difference between the Democrats and the White House and what they stand for and the Republican majority in Congress and what we stand for?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is funny my colleague from Colorado should ask me that question. Because, just as our good friend from Tennessee pointed out in paraphrasing the words of our President, Mr. Speaker, these are the words of the President, if memory serves, one day, probably less than 12 hours, after he outlined 80 new programs involving close to 80 new taxes. Mr. Speaker, he said in Buffalo, New York, and I quote, speaking of the budget surplus, "We could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right but," closed quote. There, Mr. Speaker, therein lies a major difference. It comes down to a question of who do you trust? The President thinks you ought to trust him to spend your money for you.

We say, if there is ever a choice between Washington bureaucrats and the American people, Mr. Speaker, then we side with the American people, because, Mr. Speaker, Americans know best how to save, spend and invest for themselves and their families. Therein lies a difference, a difference of freedom and a real contrast between the politics of fear from those who make outrageous claims about Social Security and our budgetary process and the true policies of hope that we embrace with lower taxes, stronger schools, a stronger military and a real plan to save Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Republican colleagues who joined me here on the floor tonight to talk about our Republican vision for America. I want to thank the thousands of constituents who write to our offices individually virtually on a weekly basis. Their voice does matter. We are here tonight to assure them that the Republican majority is listening. It is important for the American people to express their thoughts and sentiments on whether the government should continue to grow as the President would propose or whether the government should be constrained in its growth as the Republican Party proposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The Chair reminds all Members

that it is not in order to cast reflections on the Senate.

RITALIN AND THE ROLE IT PLAYS IN THE LIVES OF STUDENTS IN NORTHEAST OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE), I am glad to see the gentleman standing up there. He looks wonderful.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this great Chamber to talk about a report recently aired on my local NBC affiliate, News Channel 3. The report highlighted ritalin and the role this drug now plays in the lives of students in northeast Ohio. The report raised such concern that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I met with Department of Education officials today to direct their attention to this problem and request an investigation into the indiscriminate promotion and use of this drug and the potential harmful effects.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I believe the decision to prescribe ritalin to a child should rest with that child's physician and their parents.

Oftentimes, ritalin is prescribed to address attention deficit disorder or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. It is widely accepted as the remedy of choice for people who suffer from this brain disorder. Unfortunately, the medical community has not been able to develop a definitive test to properly diagnose ADD or ADHD related behavior. This oftentimes leads to a misdiagnosis.

The report has highlighted many examples. One, for example, is of Pam Edwards whose son Romeal attended a Catholic school in my district and was instructed to have her son use ritalin to address his behavior problem. In the alternative, her son would not be allowed to return to the school the next year if she did not. She refused to put him on this drug because she knew the root of her son's problems resulted from outside factors instead of an ill-diagnosed case of ADD.

□ 1800

I am happy to report that Romeal is doing fine in a new school and he did not need Ritalin. This is a success story, but there are many more Romeals out there whose parents might not have the insight to seek alternatives to Ritalin.

ADD or ADHD is a multiple symptom disorder coupled with the fact that many children exhibit a wide range of behavior that might be attributed to ADD or ADHD. In actuality it may or may not be that. Kids in fact will be kids.

ADD or ADHD is defined as a persistent pattern of inattention or hyper-

activity that occurs at four times more frequently in boys than girls.

When a person has been properly diagnosed with ADD or ADHD and Ritalin is prescribed, it has a remarkable track record of success. Oftentimes the drug is viewed as a godsend by parents and teachers alike because its effect is dramatic once prescribed to people who are hyperactive or easily distracted as a way to focus their minds, calm down and improve their attention spans.

Recently, at the urging of the National Institutes of Health, medical experts from around the country convened a panel discussion with doctors to address how Ritalin is being used in our society.

The use of Ritalin is not only a medical concern but it also is a big business. 1.3 million children take Ritalin regularly and sales of the drug topped \$350 million in 1995.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, the number of prescriptions for this drug has increased by over 600 percent in the last 5 years. To address this concern, manufacturers sent letters to doctors and pharmacists warning them to exert greater control over the drug.

No, I am not pointing fingers at the teachers or administrators because I know that they are one of America's greatest treasures. I am not pointing fingers at doctors or psychologists, but there appears to be a trend in my district, and I would guess the 11th Congressional District of Ohio is not unique in the use of Ritalin for behavioral purposes.

Nearly half a million prescriptions were written for controlled substances like Ritalin in 1995 for children between the ages of 3 and 6. The percentage of children with an ADHD diagnosis has jumped from 55 percent in 1989 to 75 percent in 1996. ADHD is estimated to affect 3 percent to 5 percent of children aged 5 to 14 years old, or about 1.9 million youngsters. About 10 million prescriptions were written in 1996. According to the IMS Health Association, 13.9 million prescriptions of stimulants, including Ritalin, were dispensed to children during the last school year, an 81.2 percent increase from 7.7 million 5 years earlier.

There is not a set guideline for diagnosing ADD or ADHD. No studies have been conducted in children younger than 4 years. For example, in Chicago, one of the ways that they have begun to deal with the issue is a public school system will address ADHD by offering teaching techniques.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for assisting me and supporting me in this effort.

IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

ON RITALIN PRESCRIPTIONS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, before I begin with the comments that I came to make tonight, I would like to say that I think the previous speaker has pointed out some very important things about the prescriptions of Ritalin in this country. I remember a few months ago reading in the Knoxville News-Sentinel that a retired DEA official, in fact I think he was second in command of the DEA at one time who now has retired to east Tennessee, he wrote an article pointing out that our medical community was prescribing Ritalin at over six times the rate of any other industrialized nation. I think there is a serious question as to whether or not that very serious drug, that very serious controlled substance has been overprescribed in this country, and I think we need to be very, very careful with that and make sure that it is not being used in cases where particularly small children and particularly small boys might simply be a little more active or rambunctious than some others. I do raise that cautionary note.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED SPENDING

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment about the last comments of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) who mentioned the some 80 new programs that the President proposed in his State of the Union address. The National Taxpayers Union put out a report saying that those programs if all were enacted would cost us \$288.4 billion in the first year. Newsweek had an even more interesting table a few weeks ago and had a chart which showed that if we enacted all of those programs that the President proposed, that it would lead to a \$2.3 trillion shortfall in the first 15 years. We have a good economy now but if we do something like that and allow at least a \$2.3 trillion shortfall to accumulate over these next 15 years, we could not pay the Medicare bills, we could not pay the Social Security bills, we could not do many of the most important things that the people of this country want us to do.

I rise though, Mr. Speaker, today to speak on several unrelated but very important issues facing this Nation right at this time. First, we are bombing Iraq and sending troops to Kosovo without votes by the Congress to do so. We still have troops in Bosnia in 1999 even though the President originally promised that they would stay in Bosnia no longer than the end of 1996. Yes, 1996. A few years ago, as I have mentioned before on this floor, the front page of the Washington Post had a story reporting that our troops in Haiti were picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. Then about a year ago, I heard another Member of this body say that we had our troops in Bosnia, among other things, giving rabies shots to dogs. Certainly none of us have anything against the Haitians or the Bosnians. We want to try to help them, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that

most Americans believe that the Haitians should pick up their own garbage and the Bosnians should give their own rabies shots. We have spent billions and billions of hard-earned tax dollars in recent years in Haiti, Rwanda, Bosnia and Somalia, and now in Kosovo we are going to be spending more, trying to settle or end ethnic or religious conflicts that have gone on in many cases for hundreds of years. We have spent several billions, and I am saying billions with a B, over the last few months in Iraq bombing people that our leaders tell us are not our enemies. Saddam Hussein is a ruthless, mentally ill dictator who apparently has killed many people in order to stay in power. I would agree with any bad thing you wanted to say about Hussein. In fact, I voted for the bill at the end of the last Congress to spend \$100 million to try to help remove him. Eight years ago I voted for the original Gulf War. But at that time Hussein had moved against another country, Kuwait, and he was threatening others. He had what at that time was considered to be the most powerful military in the Middle East, although we now know that his military strength had been greatly exaggerated or overestimated. But we had to stop Hussein from moving throughout the Middle East and taking over several other countries.

Now, though, his military was almost wiped out by the earlier war. He had been greatly weakened even further by the years of economic embargoes and sanctions since then. Hussein did not move against us or anyone else this time or even threaten to do so. We justify this bombing by alleging that Iraq had weapons or has weapons of mass destruction but they were weapons that U.N. inspectors did not find. Also, several countries have weapons of mass destruction, including us and most of our strongest allies. We cannot bomb everyone or every nation which has a weapon of mass destruction.

Robert Novak, the nationally syndicated columnist, called this war against Iraq a phony war. He is correct, but unfortunately it is a phony war that is costing U.S. taxpayers billions, billions that we could be using for many better purposes.

Former Congressman and Cabinet Secretary Jack Kemp said this: "The bombing is wrong, it's unjustified, and it must stop. The Iraqi people have done nothing to America or Great Britain to warrant the dropping of bombs in Baghdad."

U.S. News & World Report said: "Displays of American military might often leave the rest of the world puzzled, and this one was particularly discomfiting to both the usual carpers and friends. People spread around the world were left to wonder, like many Americans, whether this was a justified attack, or just a tack, by an American President desperate to forestall impeachment."

We are basically bombing a defenseless nation, and most Americans do not

even feel like we are at war. It is unbelievable that we are dropping bombs on people and not even giving it a second thought.

After the President's apology last August was such a monumental flop, he then ordered bombs to be dropped on Afghanistan and the Sudan, some people felt, to draw attention away from his personal problems. We now know from national press reports that we bombed a medicine factory and other civilian locations.

Also, we know that the President rushed into that bombing without notifying the Joint Chiefs of Staff or even the head of the FBI who is usually notified of actions against terrorists.

Also, the Sudan and Afghanistan bombings were done over the objections of the Attorney General. Now most people do not even remember that we did those bombings last August. Now we are bombing once again a country that cannot take one hostile or overt step against us and did not even threaten to do so. We are making enemies all over this world out of people who want to be our friends.

We started this latest Iraqi bombing on the eve of impeachment proceedings in the House, once again very questionable timing. We found out later from U.N. weapons inspector Scott Ritter that the UNSCOM report had been rigged with the White House in a lame attempt to try to justify the bombing.

The Christian Science Monitor, one of our leading national newspapers, and a newspaper, I might say, that usually supports the President, reported a few days ago that there are conflicts, fighting going on right now in 46 different locations around the world. Are we going to send troops to all 46? Are we going to send troops into every country? Obviously we cannot do this. It would cost far too many billions, and even our wasteful Federal Government does have some limits.

Right now our young people and many others are concerned about the future of Social Security. We really do not know how we will pay the staggering medical bills of the future. At a time when both air passenger traffic and air cargo traffic are shooting way up and all economic development is so tied into aviation, the President's budget is cutting aviation spending by several billion by reducing the Airport Improvement Program and eliminating the general fund contribution to the FAA. Yet we are spending billions to turn our military into international social workers.

We should try to be friends with every nation in the world, but we should not mortgage our own future in the process. We should send advisers in every field to help other nations which want us to do that. But we cannot continue sending billions and billions every time some other nation has a serious problem. Also, where there is an international tragedy of some sort, we need to quickly convene a meeting and ask Sweden and Germany and France

and Japan and all other nations how much they will contribute. Right now we are carrying far too much of these burdens on our shoulders alone.

And we basically are following a CNN foreign policy. We seem to get involved in a big way in whichever situation is being given the most prominence at the moment on the national news. Now we are going into Kosovo against the recommendations of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, columnist Charles Krauthammer and many, many others.

George Washington in his farewell address warned us against entangling ourselves in the affairs of other nations. Dwight Eisenhower, a career military man, warned us against the military-industrial complex.

Why are we doing these things? Why are we attempting to be the world's policeman? Why are we so eager to drop bombs and doing so in such a cavalier, even careless manner?

Part of it involves money, the military-industrial complex that President Eisenhower warned us about. Eisenhower believed, and I believe, that national defense is one of the most important and most legitimate functions of our national government. But some leaders of the military, now that most Cold War threats have diminished, are desperately searching for military missions so that their appropriations will not be cut. How else can you explain such eagerness to send troops or to drop bombs on countries which are no threat whatsoever to our national security and where no vital U.S. interest is at stake? Those should be the key tests, whether our national security or whether a vital U.S. interest is at stake. Certainly that is not present in Kosovo or many of these other places where we have gone and where we have spent so many billions in recent years.

Then, too, I think we are doing it in part because of the psychology of power and of human beings. Most men when they are running for President want that position more than anything they have ever wanted. But I think they soon become dissatisfied with running only the United States and then start wanting more. They want to be seen as world statesmen, great leaders of the world, not simply just a great leader of the U.S. alone. It seems to be human nature to always want more or something different, and this is especially true of hard-charging, ambitious, driven people. And these desires, these ambitions are always encouraged and supported by companies which benefit from billions in military expenditures, the military-industrial complex about which Eisenhower warned us.

□ 1815

Many liberals and big-government types, even some big-government conservatives, resort to name calling and childish sarcasm against anyone who opposes spending all these billions overseas. They will not discuss these issues on the merits but simply dismiss

as isolationist anyone who speaks out against any foreign adventure that they dream up.

Our first obligation though, Mr. Speaker, as the Congress of the United States, should be to the citizens and taxpayers of the United States. It should not be to take billions and billions of their money and spend it on problems in Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and on, and on, and on. What we need are foreign policies that put this Nation and its people first for a change. What we need is an American-first foreign policy, even if it is not politically correct or fashionable to say so.

Apparently, many people accept wasting all these billions today because they think our economy is stronger than it really is. Well, I might just say a few things about that. Levi Strauss has just announced that it is moving 6,000 more jobs to other countries. Last year, that company closed its largest facility in my hometown of Knoxville; and 2,200 people lost their jobs.

Last year was a record layoff in this country, a record year in this country for layoffs. Personal bankruptcies are at an all-time high, 1.4 million this past year alone. Our trade deficit hit a record 170 billion which means conservatively, according to the economists, we lose at least 20,000 jobs per billion, 3.4 million jobs, 3,400,000 jobs to other countries.

Many college graduates today cannot find jobs except in restaurants, and certainly there is nothing wrong with working in a restaurant, but you hope that people who get bachelors and masters degrees from colleges can find something a little better than that.

Our trade deficit with Japan reached 64 billion. The deficit with China was 57 billion, 57 billion. This is the same China that funneled millions in campaign contributions to influence the last presidential election.

The President has done several things, this administration has done several things, that will be very harmful for this Nation for many years long after he has left office and the administration has left office, when the problems that have been caused will be blamed on someone else. One involves the Chinese. The President ordered the sale of missile technology to the Chinese unbelievably over the objections of the State Department, the Defense Department and the Justice Department. Now the Chinese have, according to our intelligence reports, at least 13 nuclear warheads aimed at the U.S., missiles they could not have gotten here without the technology that millions of campaign contributions apparently got for them. Some apparently came from top executives of the Hughes Electronic Corporation, which sold some of this technology to the Chinese.

Now the Chinese have missiles pointed at Taiwan, our ally that we have a legal obligation to defend. We will now have to spend billions, extra billions, in

the years ahead to defend against this Chinese threat, the same Chinese who are eating our lunch in trade to the tune of a \$57 billion trade deficit with that country alone last year.

Nations like China at 57 billion, I might repeat, would be 1.4 million jobs, 1,400,000 jobs lost from this country to China last year because of that trade deficit. Nations like China, like Japan, nations all over this world need access to our markets far more than we need theirs. We need free trade, but it needs to be free in both directions, and we have economic leverage that we have not used in recent years because we have not put our own country first. We need trade policies that put America and its workers first even if our President and the national media and multinational businesses do not agree.

Another example of how the President's policy will hurt people for many years to come is the decision to lock up the largest low-sulfur coal deposit in the world in Utah, once again apparently in return for hundreds of thousands or possibly millions in campaign contributions from the Riady family of Indonesia, the owners of the second-largest low-sulfur coal deposit. Because our utilities are required to buy mostly low-sulfur coal, people all over this Nation will have to pay higher utility bills for years because of a political decision done in secret which had the double whammy effect of gaining huge campaign contributions and pleasing environmental extremists.

That brings me to another but related point. Environmental extremists are the new radicals, the new socialists, the new leftists in this country today. Many people do not realize how extreme many of them have become. They almost always, these environmental extremists almost always come from wealthy or upper middle income backgrounds and usually have sufficient wealth to insulate themselves from the harm they do to the poor and working people of this country. Everyone wants clean air and clean water, but some of these environmental extremists are not satisfied that we have the toughest clean air and clean water laws and other tough environmental laws, the toughest in the world. They constantly demand more, often supported by large contributions from many of our biggest corporations.

And I might say that the administration is trying to convince us to enter into the Kyoto agreement. Well, the Kyoto agreement is really just an attempt by some people that are upset that we have only 4 percent, a little over 4 percent of the world's population, yet we have about 25 percent of the world's wealth, and they want to do a massive transfer of that wealth to other less developed countries. And so there is something like 125 less developed countries who do not have to participate and abide by the Kyoto agreement, but we have to.

And if we go through with that, if the Senate was to ratify that or if we try

to go through the back door and enact all the Kyoto protocols in appropriations bills and in various other ways through regulations, we will destroy so many thousands of jobs in this country and drive up prices, and once again the people that will be hurt the most will be the poor and working people of this country.

I mentioned that many of these environmental extremists are supported by some of our biggest corporations. The big corporations can comply with all the rules and regulations and red tape. They have the money and the staff and the lobbyists and the political connections to do so. And what happens? The big keep getting bigger and the small and now even the medium-sized business struggle to survive or go by the wayside.

When I was growing up, a poor man could start a gas station. Now, primarily due to all the environmental and governmental regulatory overkill, only the wealthy or big corporations can do it. Environmental extremists destroy jobs and opportunities, drive up prices and in the process become the best friends extremely big businesses have ever had.

There is a big move now to cut down on agricultural run-off or spill-off. Here again the regulations are making it even harder for small farmers to survive while big corporate farms, agribusiness really, can benefit by seeing much of their competition with small farmers removed.

Big government in the end, Mr. Speaker, has really helped primarily extremely big businesses and the bureaucrats who work for the Federal Government, and that is really all they have. The poor and the working people in this country and the small business people and the small farmers get the shaft. Everyone else gets the shaft. The intended beneficiaries get a few crumbs from most programs, but more jobs would be created and prices would be lower if more government money was left in the private sector.

In fact, government money does create jobs, but money left in the private sector creates on the average about two and one half times as many jobs. Why? The private sector, especially small business, is simply less wasteful and more efficient in their spending. They have to be to survive.

Edward Rendell, the Democratic mayor of Philadelphia, said in a congressional hearing a few years ago, quote:

Government does not work because there is no incentive for people to work hard, so many do not. There is no incentive for people to save money, so much of it is squandered.

How true that statement is.

The easiest thing in the world, Mr. Speaker, is to spend other people's money. Also, when it comes to politicians, usually those who proclaim their compassion the loudest usually have the least with their own personal money.

Talk about the efficiency of the private sector. I had the privilege of meeting a few days ago with the head of Embraer, a Brazilian company that produces regional jets. He said that when Embraer was a government corporation in late 1994, it was producing \$40,000 of product per employee. The company privatized in December of 1994 and now produces \$240,000 per employee, six times as much in just a little over 4 years.

When speaking of the great benefits of a private, free-enterprise economy, we should remember that private property is one of the keys, one of the foundation stones of prosperity. Today, however, the Federal Government owns over 30 percent of the land in this country, and State and local governments and quasi-governmental units own another 20 percent. Approximately half the land today is in some type of government control, and the really worrisome thing is the rapid rate at which governments at all levels are taking on even more.

In addition, governments are putting more and more restrictions on what private land owners can do with their own land, taking away or putting limitations on a very important part of our freedom. They also, if they take over much more land, will drive out of reach for many young Americans a big part of the American dream, and that is to own their own homes. Once again, much of this is done or accepted in this misguided worship of the environment, leading to a very great expansion of government control over our lives.

Some environmental extremists even advocate something called the Wildlands Project, which has the goal of turning 50 percent of the United States into wilderness where it is not already designated that way. This may sound good on the surface, but it would require moving millions of people out of their homes and off of land that they presently own.

People take better care of land they personally own than they do of property that is publicly owned. Look at the big city housing projects that have had to be blown up after just 15 or 20 years because no one felt the pride of ownership, and the properties deteriorated unbelievably fast.

We would be better off and could sustain a good economy far longer if we had more land in private ownership and less in public or government control. Yet we are going very rapidly in the opposite direction, and our wonderful environmental extremists fight the Federal government giving up even one acre of land. They want more and more and more.

What an environmentalist should realize is that the socialist and communist nations have been the worst polluters in the world. Their economic systems did not give people incentives or put pressure on them to conserve and instead really encouraged or at least did not prevent wasteful use of resources.

Also, our environmentalist should realize that only capitalist free market economies can produce the excess funds necessary to do the good things for the environment that we all want done. Environmental extremists have done such a good job in recent years brainwashing young people that I bet very few even realize that we have far more land in forests in the U.S. today than we did 50 years ago or that forests, to remain healthy, some trees need to be cut.

When control of Congress changed, and I will talk about the economy again for a minute, when control of the Congress changed hands in November of 1994, the stock market was at 3800. Today, the Dow Jones average is almost at 9400. The economy has done well for several reasons, among which are we reformed the welfare system against two presidential vetoes and several million people are now contributing and paying in rather than taking out. Also, the Congress brought Federal spending under control by passing a balanced budget, once again against three presidential vetoes, but at least we brought Federal spending under control.

There is a misunderstanding or misimpression among some that we have cut Federal spending. Federal spending has gone up each year. It is just that instead of giving, as we routinely were, just 8 or 10 years ago giving 10 and 12 and 15 and 18 percent increases to almost every department and agency, we are now giving 2 or 3 percent increases.

□ 1830

We have Federal spending under control. Also the Federal Reserve has acted in a very conservative manner, and we have reduced the capital gains tax and stopped the trend towards higher and higher Federal taxes.

However, Federal taxes are still far too high. They are taking more of our GDP than at any time in the last 55 years since World War II. As I mentioned a few minutes ago in the colloquy with some of my colleagues on the Floor, today the average person, not the wealthy but the average person, is paying about 40 percent of his or her income in taxes of all types, Federal, State, and local, and at least another 10 percent in government regulatory costs.

One member of the other body said not too long ago that one spouse works to support government while the other spouse works to support the family. Yet, the President said in Buffalo recently, as we quoted here earlier, that we cannot give the people a tax cut because they would not spend it wisely. They would do a far better job, Mr. Speaker, spending it than our wasteful, inefficient Federal Government would.

One example, and I could give many today, the Federal Government spends about \$26,000 per year per student in the Job Corps program. Most of this money goes to fat cat government con-

tractors and bureaucrats, so these students would be shocked to know that we are spending this much on them each year. But we could give each of these students a \$1,000 a month allowance, send them to some expensive private school, and still save money, and the young people involved would probably feel like they had won the lottery.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me spend a few minutes discussing one topic of great importance. Before I get into this final topic, let me just give another example of how harmful all of this overtaxation and over government spending has hurt the American people, and particularly, American families.

Before I came to Congress I spent 7½ years as a criminal court judge trying felony criminal cases. About 96 or 97 percent of those people plead guilty in the criminal courts throughout the country. Then they apply for probation. So I received, in that 7½ years, several thousand reports going into the backgrounds of all of these defendants.

The first day I was judge, Gary Tulick, the chief probation counselor for East Tennessee, told me that 98 percent of the defendants in felony cases came from broken homes. I would read over and over and over and over again reports like, defendant's father left home to get pack of cigarettes and never came back. Defendant's father left home when defendant was 2 and never returned.

I know that many wonderful people have come from broken homes, but I also know that, particularly with young boys, that the breakup of a home has had an extremely harmful effect on many young boys.

I saw a report in the Washington Times a few years ago in which two leading criminologists had studied 11,000 felony cases from around the country. They said the biggest single factor in serious crime, bar none, nothing else was even close, was father-absent households. How true that is.

In 1950 the Federal Government was taking about 4 percent from the average family, and State and local governments were taking another 4 percent, roughly. Many women had the choice of staying at home to raise their children, and many families were able to stay together, because most marriages—I saw one study which showed that 59 percent of all marriages break up in arguments over finances. That is the biggest single factor, disagreements about money.

But today, and for many years, the government at all levels has been taking so much money from the families of America that I think it has caused many serious problems. Many families I think have not been able to stay together or have ended up getting in serious disputes that have led to divorces and the breakup of families because government at all levels has been taking so much money from them.

I believe that the best thing we could do to lower the incidence of serious crime in this country would be to

greatly decrease the size and cost of the government at all levels, so that the families of this country could keep more of their own money to spend on their children in the ways that they see fit and that they know are best for them and their children.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me talk on one last topic for a few minutes, discussing something that is of great importance to everyone. That is health care.

Today health care is the only thing all of us pay for through a third-party payer system. If we bought food through a third-party payer system, millions would be starving. If we bought cars through a third-party payer system, a Yugo probably would have cost us \$300,000.

Before the Federal Government got into medical care in a big way in the mid sixties, medical costs were low and flat for many years. A lot of young people ought to look at that, and look back and see how low and flat medical costs were for all those years that the Federal Government stayed out of it. But when the Federal Government got into it in a big way in the mid sixties, we took what was a very minor problem for a very few people and turned it into a major problem for everyone.

I remember in the late seventies when the liberals were saying Medicaid would save the medical system. Four or five years ago the Washington Post ran a series of front page stories about Medicaid. A member of the other body, Senator ROCKEFELLER, who I think was one of the people who helped found the Medicaid system, was quoted as saying about Medicaid, "It is a horrible system, a vile system, and it ought to be abolished."

A scholar from the Brookings Institution said about it, "It is a success story of the American political system. We create a system so horrible that we are forced to go to total reform."

I was told yesterday by one of the leaders of the Tennessee legislature that TennCare, our replacement or reform of Medicaid, will go up 12 percent this year, and maybe as much as 15 or 20 percent a year in future years. If it does, we would be in a catastrophic situation. Third-party payer systems are inevitably doomed to failure. They will never work. In any politicized medical system, those who are the best organized or most politically powerful get rich, but it is a disaster for everyone else.

In recent years we have seen some doctors, nursing home operators, big home health care operators, and big hospital chain owners get rich, but we have turned health care into a major problem for everyone except possibly Bill Gates and Warren Buffett.

In a private free market system, we get much more fairness and we do not have the big winners and even bigger losers that we have in a politicized big government medical system.

In fact, the main point of what I have been saying here tonight is just that.

Poor and working people can get lower prices and many more job opportunities and have much better lives in a true free market system than in any other way.

If Members do not believe that, all they have to do is look around the world. I remember in the former Soviet Union the leaders of the former Soviet Union had, before their total collapse that they are undergoing right now, they had their dachas by the sea and their limousines and their special department stores. Other people, which was the great, great majority, 99-plus percent of the people, had to line up for hours to buy, say, a pound of sausage, or something that we run into a store for and take for granted as being able to purchase.

Every place in the world where the people have let the government get too big, people have ended up starving. It really is pretty simple, Mr. Speaker. Big government means a very small elite upper class, a huge underclass, and almost no middle class. A very small government means a very small elite, a huge middle class, and very few at the bottom.

We really should pay for medical care the same way that we pay for food. Then it would be cheap. If we could get the government and the insurance companies out of medical care, medical costs probably would not even be 5 percent of what they are. However, too many doctors and nursing home owners and health care providers are getting rich off the system the way it is today to get the government and the insurance companies out.

So since we cannot realistically do that, the only real hope is to go to a medical savings account or medical voucher system to get the consumer involved once again, to give people some incentives to shop around for medical care.

Right now we are distorting the law of supply and demand, because the number of doctors is going way up but so are the costs. We need to get at least some free market incentives into the system, because we are headed for a collapse within our medical system if we do not. Then the people will start demanding, if we let it collapse, they will start demanding national government-run health care, which is the worst of all worlds, as has been shown in country after country all over this world. Then we would end up with shortages, waiting periods, rationing, the closing of many small and rural hospitals, people having to go further and further distances for health care, a rapid decline in the quality of care, and on and on.

If the government had not gotten into medical care to the extent it already has, we never would have had HMOs and people being kicked out of hospitals way too early, or denied treatment in the first place.

We need major reform in medical care, Mr. Speaker, but if we give even more government control and involve-

ment, the system will become even more expensive as it grows worse and worse. The few will get rich and the many will suffer, as with any and every big government program.

AMERICA'S BIGGEST SOCIAL PROBLEM: ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House tonight and the American public to talk about a problem which I believe is our biggest social problem as a country, our biggest social problem as a Congress. That is the problem of illegal narcotics and the damage it is doing to our population, and particularly to our young people across this land.

Some people in Congress or some people in leadership positions would have us think that the Y2K problem is the major problem, or that other dotting I and crossing T of legislation is the major problem facing Congress. But I believe that we have no more important responsibility as legislators of this Nation than to see that we do the best job possible in addressing a problem, an epidemic that is ravaging havoc, particularly among our young people.

The statistics are mind-boggling. Last year over 14,200 Americans lost their lives because of drug-related deaths. Let me cite a few other statistics that every Member of Congress and every American should be aware of, when they turn away from the question of a drug problem, when they are given some other problem, smoking or Y2K or whatever the issue of the day may be that rates in the polls. Let me talk about the hard facts of what illegal narcotics are doing to us as a Nation.

The overall number of past month heroin users increased 378 percent from 1993 to 1997 in this country. Between 1992 and 1997, drug-related emergency room episodes nationwide increased 25 percent, and they increased 7 percent between 1996 and 1997. Between 1993 and 1997, LSD emergency room incidents increased 142 percent; not declined, but inclined.

Additionally, from 1993 to 1997, our youth aged 12 to 17 using drugs has more than doubled. It has increased 120 percent. There has been a 27 percent increase between 1996 and 1997. This is a 1998 national household survey.

In 1998, more than three-quarters, actually 7 percent, of our high school teens reported that drugs are sold or kept at their schools, an increase of 6 percent over 1996.

During 1997, statistically significant increases in heroin emergency room incidents were observed in Miami, a 77 percent increase; in New Orleans, a 63 percent increase; in Phoenix, a 49 percent increase; and in Chicago, a 47 percent increase.

Let me also add this statistic. Significant increases in methamphetamine, speed, emergency room incidents were observed in Detroit, a 233 percent increase; Seattle, a 207 percent increase; Atlanta, a 151 percent increase; and St. Paul, Minneapolis, 110 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, we have, as a result, 1.8 million Americans behind bars, and the estimates are 60 to 70 percent of those Americans behind bars are there because of a drug-related offense. What is absolutely staggering is the cost of all of this to the American taxpayers. Let me tell the Members, from the drug czar's office in a recent report, what the cost is to the American taxpayers.

□ 1845

American taxpayers footed a \$150 billion bill for drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997 alone. That is more than what we set in our 1997 Federal budgets for our programs to fund education, transportation improvements, agriculture, energy, space and all foreign aid combined. That is the cost to this Nation.

One of the most staggering statistics, and I have quoted this before on the floor of the House of Representatives, is that our young people, our kids from age 12 to 15, in this population range, first-time heroin use, which has proven to kill, deadly heroin, surged a whopping 875 percent from 1991 to 1996.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me as someone from a wonderful district in central Florida, my district runs from Orlando to Daytona Beach, is not just the national statistics, the national impact, the national lives that are lost, but the local devastation that this problem has imposed on my rather affluent, good economy, highly educated population. A wonderful placid area.

Mr. Speaker, every time I pick up the paper, and here is the latest newspaper, another individual, this one the latest, a death of a woman, age 38, died of a heroin overdose this weekend in central Florida. And this is in addition to another young man who died a horrible death, the sheriff told me, in a central Florida restroom of a heroin overdose.

A recent headline in my area newspapers stated that drug overdose deaths exceeded homicides, and most of these were heroin, a very deadly drug which has come across our border and into our streets in record numbers.

Now, how did we get ourselves into this situation? Let us go back to 1993 when the Clinton administration took over and they had a majority in both this House and the other body. What did they do? They changed our national drug policy.

Under the Reagan administration, and I was there, I worked as a staffer for Senator Hawkins in the 1980s, there were many initiatives adopted by Congress that tried to get a handle on the national and international drug problem that at that time was facing Florida and our country. What we did was a number of things. First, we tried to

stop drugs at their source. Then we created an Andean Strategy, eradication of crops of coca and heroin at their source.

We also tried to interdict drugs using the military, using whatever means we had available, our Coast Guard, to stop drugs before they got into our border. And then we tried tough enforcement.

What happened in that period of time, from 1992 to 1995, is that the Clinton administration made a policy decision to cut some of those programs. They cut interdiction from \$2 billion to \$1.2 billion in 1995. So, they went down 37 percent in the period from 1992 to 1995.

The international programs to stop drugs at their source, the Andean Strategy, stopping drugs by eradicating the drugs and by crop substitution programs and other programs that stop drugs as they were being produced in the fields, was cut from \$633 million to \$289 million in 1996, a 54 percent decrease.

These are the figures. Let me put these up here. Again, a 37 percent decrease in drugs interdiction budgets and the source country programs, the international programs. These are the exact figures, a 53 percent decrease.

So what happened there? We had, in fact, a flood of drugs coming into this country. For example, with those decisions came some administrative decisions and let me cite some of those again that took place in the period of 1994 and 1995.

National Guard container searches using the military to help in the war on drugs dropped from 237 in 1994 to 209 in 1995. Other National Guard workday drug interdictions fell from 597 in 1994 to 530 in 1996.

Drug interdiction budget and asset cuts in the Department of Defense in 1995. The flight hours devoted to counterdrug missions was decreased from 51,000 to 50,000 in one year, and also shipdays active in drug interdiction were cut from 2,268 in 1994 to 1,545 in 1995.

As a result, we have seen a flood of illegal narcotics coming into the United States. Additionally, there were some policies at that time that did incredible damage to us as a Nation. In addition to the source country decreases, in addition to drug interdiction cuts in the activities of the military, the administration first out cut the office of the drug czar and the drug czar's budget.

The next really offensive move by the administration was to appoint a Surgeon General who sent a message to our young people of "Just say maybe." Additionally, what hurt us tremendously in the effort to curtail cocaine production, coca production and also heroin production, was the abolition and the decision by the administration to stop a shutdown policy. We had provided information and assistance to South American countries, primarily Peru, Bolivia and Colombia, which were engaged in trying to curtail ille-

gal narcotics trafficking and we provided them some information and assistance. A liberal decision out of one of our agencies stopped that type of assistance and, in turn, there was a period in which this shutdown policy was shot down by this administration, and it took a concerted effort and over a year to get that put back in place. We have done that.

And, of course, they took the military out and cut the Coast Guard budgets, so we saw a flood of illegal narcotics coming into this country.

During the period from 1995 onward in the country of Colombia, another administrative action did a great deal of damage. It was the policy of Congress, and we passed laws, we passed appropriations, asking that assistance go to Colombia. Because of concern of human rights violations, because of other problems with the last administration in Colombia, the administration basically stopped getting helicopters to Colombia, getting resources to Colombia, getting assistance to stop the production of coca and also heroin poppies in that country.

What has happened in the meantime is an incredible flood of coca cultivation. In fact, the subcommittee which I chair recently visited Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Mexico and Panama, and I will report on that in just a minute. One of the things that we found that was most startling was that now Colombia produces more cocaine than any other country in the world. It formerly was a processing center for cocaine and now is a producer.

This policy, again from the 1993 to 1995, 1996 period of the administration, basically shut down our efforts and our assistance to Colombia to stop illegal narcotics cultivation, so we have cocaine major production there.

Additionally, we had an incredible flood of heroin coming out of Colombia. It is coming up through the Caribbean into Florida and it is also coming up through and transiting through Mexico, working with the Mexican cartels.

So these are the results of a failed policy that this administration adopted some years ago. The death in our streets, the dramatic increase in heroin on our streets. That cultivation is there for a reason. It is specifically because of a failed policy.

Now, recently I received, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, a presentation by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The 1999 proposed drug control strategy, and also the budget for this administration.

I have raised some great concerns about this budget and this strategy. This is a strategy for losing. This is not a war on drugs. This is a mild effort to eliminate some drug trafficking, some drug production. I believe that we can expedite what is proposed in this strategy. I believe there are some fundamental flaws in what has been proposed by the administration and this is

a losing strategy and a losing budget and we certainly should have learned from the past.

First of all, the most effective way to stop drugs are to eliminate drugs at their source. If one cannot grow coca, they cannot produce cocaine. There have traditionally only been two countries that have produced cocaine in large quantities: Bolivia and Peru. Both of those countries, where we visited and met with the presidents of those countries, have committed within the last 2 or 3 years, working primarily with this new majority in Congress, to eradicate drugs at their source. Very cost-effective. Very few dollars spent.

Now, we learned through the budget that was proposed from 1991 to 1995 how not to do things and it is amazing that this new budget by this administration does not address proper funding for the microherbicide program. That is a program to eliminate drugs through a chemical process, conducting the R&D to deal biologically with the production of coca and other hard drugs such as heroin and poppies.

Did we not learn that when we cut Customs and interdiction and do not properly fund them that drugs come from where they are grown to the next stage? Again, the President's budget, the President's strategy is lacking in adequate funding to provide the resources necessary to stop drugs at their next stage. And each of these stages I view as cost-effective frontiers in this effort.

Once we get to the streets, once we get to local enforcement, it is extremely expensive and costly in lost lives and enforcement to try to catch those drugs when they are in our schools and in our communities and with our young people.

This budget by this administration also fails to address one of the most fundamental needs, and that is that we have proper intelligence, adequate intelligence. If I have learned anything in this war on illegal drugs, it is that intelligence is so important, particularly in enforcement and interdiction and even eradication. If we know where the drugs are, if we know who is dealing the drugs, if we have the proper intelligence, we can save lives. Again we can cost-effectively stop traffickers in pursuit of their deadly profession purveying, again, heroin, cocaine, methamphetamines and other hard drugs.

So, not spending the adequate resources or funding for intelligence is lacking in the President's strategy and in the drugs czar's proposal to Congress.

□ 1900

Once again, we have seen the cuts for the Coast Guard that the administration made, and I cited some of those just a few minutes ago, that were mistakes and will be mistakes in this budget. So they have not adequately funded the operations of the Coast Guard.

Let me give an illustration in central Florida. Some of the heroin that we have coming into central Florida has transited through Puerto Rico. Why through Puerto Rico? This is a new pattern in the last 5, 6 years. Because back in 1995, this administration and the years before that, several years before that cut the Coast Guard operations almost 50 percent.

The Coast Guard is the line of defense around Puerto Rico and has kept that secure, again, through the 1980s and early 1990s from drugs transiting through there. That Guard was let down. Here again, an incredible error on the part of the administration and the drug czar's office.

The President's strategy, if you call it a strategy, is to let down the funding for the Coast Guard for operation and maintenance, one of the most important ingredients for success.

Finally, properly funding U.S.-Mexico border security. Now if we know that 60 to 70 percent of the hard drugs coming into the United States are coming in through Mexico, transiting through Mexico, then we know where we have a major drug transiting problem. It does not take rocket science to figure this out. So, again, we have another perimeter of defense that is not being secured by the proposal of this administration.

What is of major concern to me is that some of the money in this budget in big chunks is being spent to correct mistakes and errors. One of the biggest mistakes and errors that we found in visiting some of the producing and transiting countries that our subcommittee visited was in Panama.

In Panama, the United States of America is getting its clock cleaned. There is no other way to put it. We have been out-negotiated. We have lost basically our interest in the Panama Canal.

We will be turning over, we will be giving the keys to the Panama Canal. I wanted to pull out my keys here as an illustration. These are the keys to the Panama Canal. We will be giving them to Panamanian officials by December of this year.

What is scary is all of our forward drug reconnaissance efforts are located in Panama right now as we speak. The administration is scrambling at this hour because they lost the treaty agreements. They could not negotiate them. They got to the end. The whole thing collapsed.

We are turning over \$10 billion in assets, 5,000 buildings. We basically in May have to stop all of our overflights. So they are scrambling now to find another location, which we asked questions about, for our forward reconnaissance in the war on drugs.

They will probably be relocated in Ecuador and also in Aruba and that area as they, again, are working at this point to patch together some forward reconnaissance operation. Not to mention that we will have to relocate such assets as AWACS and other reconnais-

sance equipment and airplanes from that area.

So the situation in Panama is pure chaos. The situation regarding even the operation of the ports, we were told that corruption has dictated how the awards for control of those ports will be determined, and that the Red Chinese, in fact, will control one of those port activities and gain that through corrupt activities.

A very scary scene, when it comes to dealing with the Panama Canal, with the billions of United States dollars invested in that area all lost. Also, from my perspective, the war on drugs, where we are being booted out, and at great cost in this budget, as I started to say, one of the biggest items is moving that operation, which will cost the taxpayers \$73.5 million. I think that is just the tip of the iceberg. So those are how some of the dollars are being spent in a strategy that does not make sense.

If you think that the administration would want to spend more than we spent last year and would come out and say we need to spend more resources, I am not a big spender, I am one of the lowest spenders in Congress, but of all of the things we should be spending more money on, it is this effort, whether it is education and prevention and treatment and interdiction, law enforcement, but actually from a total spending of \$17.9 billion in last year's full appropriations for this effort to stem illegal narcotics, the administration drops down to \$17.8 million, 109 net million dollars less in spending.

In addition, if we add in the mistakes to correct in Panama, we are probably looking at \$250 million in funds less than we spent the year before. Additionally, what concerns me is that the administration talks a good line about helping our communities' education and prevention.

I might say that a Republican Congress added \$195 million for the ads that are now being aired on television for the information program that is being conducted by the Office of National Drug Control Policy and matched by the private sector.

But, additionally, the administration played games with their proposal and their budget and their strategy by not funding some of the programs that we passed. For example, the Drug-Free Communities Act, they came in \$8 million below our authorization and request.

So if we want to do something about drugs in our communities, we have got to interdict. We have got to educate. We have got to enforce. But we have to have an honest proposal on the table from the administration. I do not believe that is the case.

I would like to turn now, to the latest chapter in the war on drugs, and I will be addressing the Congress and the Nation on a repeated basis. People may get tired of hearing about it. But, again, since it has such a big impact on our communities, I will be here talking about it.

Since the Speaker of the House has given me that responsibility as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, I will, again, be bringing this consistently to the attention of the public and the Congress.

The latest chapter is another sad chapter and mistake. Again, I said earlier, if we knew where 60 to 70 percent of the drugs were coming from, we would do something about it. We would target that. Now, we know where 60 to 70 percent of the drugs are. These are not my figures. These are the administration's figures, the Office of Drug Control Policy, the Office of the Chief DEA Administrator of the land. These are, again, their figures.

We know where hard drugs, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine are coming from. They are coming from Mexico. Again, the latest chapter is that, yesterday, the President of the United States, and last week he said he was going to do it, but he did it on the deadline, yesterday, March 1, he certified Mexico as fully cooperating with the United States on the war on drugs.

Let me say something about the certification process since I helped draft that with Senator Hawkins back in the mid 1980s, that law. The law is a simple law. The law says that the State Department shall review the progress of every country that is involved in narcotics production and trafficking and determine whether they are fully cooperating with, eliminating, or helping to reduce drug production and drug trafficking.

That is what certification is. They must certify honestly, and the President must present honestly whether a country is cooperating, fully cooperating, those are the terms of the law, in eliminating drug production and drug trafficking.

Why are they certifying? They are certifying to make that country eligible for foreign aid, foreign assistance, foreign trade benefits, and foreign financial assistance of the United States. These are benefits of the United States, again, in trade and finance and foreign aid. So if they are fully cooperating, they are eligible for foreign aid and foreign assistance.

It is a simple law. The law has been convoluted. The law has not been properly interpreted by this administration. It certainly has not been applied appropriately by this President.

The President ironically went to Mexico and met with President Zedillo several weeks ago. He said Mexico should not be penalized for having the courage to confront its problems. Now, that is a new Clinton-speak.

What are the facts about cooperation, full cooperation? What is the pattern of conduct of officials there in trying to stop production and stop trafficking.

Let me quote, if I may, the DEA Administrator Tom Constantine who has great courage, an official of this administration, in charge of our Federal

Drug Enforcement Agency. He testified in a recent Congressional hearing on the other side of the Congress, and let me quote, "In my lifetime, I have never witnessed any group of criminals that has had such a terrible impact on so many individuals and communities in our nation," Mr. Constantine said. "They have infiltrated cities and towns around the United States, visiting upon these places addiction, misery, increased criminal activities and increased homicides."

"There is no doubt that those individuals running these organized criminal drug-trafficking syndicates today are responsible for degrading the quality of life not only in towns along the Southwest border of the United States, but increasingly, cities in middle America."

This is what the chief law enforcement officer of our Nation said regarding Mexico's participation. This article further went on to state, and let me quote this, that "No major traffickers were indicted in Mexico last year; drug seizures dropped significantly; fewer drug laboratories were seized; total arrests declined; the number of drug cases dropped; and seizures of drug-carrying automobiles, boats, and trucks also declined."

Is this a pattern of cooperation? Is this a pattern that deserves certification so that Mexico is eligible for benefits and foreign assistance of the United States?

Let me cite from another article and some other statistics about Mexico's performance. Again, 60 to 70 percent of the cocaine and heroin that come into the United States come in through Mexico. It is estimated that 85 percent of the methamphetamine, the foreign methamphetamine comes in from Mexico. It is produced in Mexico.

Another recent article said that Mexico has increased heroin production by sixfold in the last 2 years.

□ 1915

Not only are they transiting hard drugs, they are now becoming a significant producer of heroin from that country. Chemical precursor laws are not being enforced in Mexico. Mexican heroin seized in the United States between 1995 and 1996 quadrupled.

Now, another significant thing, and every American should listen to this, and every young person who is listening should listen to this, the purity of the heroin coming into the United States from Mexico and from these other countries in the last 2 years has jumped from a purity level of 7 to 20 percent to 50 to 76 percent. That is why we are seeing so many deaths. That is why we are seeing the destruction of so many lives, because this is deadly heroin. These are deadly drugs with high purity and high potency coming into the United States. And any time a young person or anyone else abuses these drugs and mixes it with anything else, they risk death and they risk destroying their lives.

Last year, 15 metric tons of heroin came into the United States through Mexico. We had a 27 percent increase in heroin use in the United States between 1996 and 1997. So more heroin is coming in, more heroin is being used, and most of the heroin that we see, again, is coming through Mexico or now being produced in Mexico.

Now, we are neighbors, we are partners, we are friends. There are millions of Mexican-Americans in the United States who are good citizens. We have a long relationship of friendly trade, of finance, communication, and cultural exchanges between our two countries. I think the United States, and the Congress in particular, and this administration, have gone even overboard to extend benefits to Mexico as a partner, as a friend, as an ally and a neighbor. We have given probably some of the best trade benefits to Mexico as to any country in the world.

When Mexico's pesos were faltering and the economy was heading down the tubes a few years ago, we, as friends and neighbors, went in and helped bail them out. In return, we heard the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN), talk about jobs that are lost in the United States and lowered opportunity. And what has happened is we have actually given up much of our trade, much of our manufacturing to Mexico.

We just got the recent figures for 1998, and our trade deficit was \$15.7 billion. That means more goods being sold by Mexico in the United States, contributing to our whopping trade deficit. So here we are good friends, we are good allies, and we ask for cooperation, and what do we get? We get an unbelievable quantity and quality of hard, deadly drugs coming into our country from Mexico.

Let me again cite the statistics of the cost of drug abuse in this country. Last year, we had 14,218 Americans, and this is actually last year. They have the wrong date up here. They were killed last year at a cost of \$67 billion. This is the cost in lives and Americans who will no longer see the light of day. And if we calculate 60 to 70 percent of the hard narcotics coming into the United States, we can figure that we have 8,000 or 9,000 Americans dying from drugs that came in through Mexico.

I am not the only one that questions the certification of Mexico, and this should not be a partisan question. Let me, if I may, read a quote from the minority leader of the House of Representatives. "After reviewing the past year's record, I am compelled to disagree with the President's decision to certify Mexico as fully cooperating with our government in the fight against drugs." And that is the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), who said that in a quote last Saturday in the Dallas Morning News. So, again, there is bipartisan concern about what is happening with Mexico.

Why that concern? The statistics, again, speak for themselves.

Mexican drug seizures for opium from 1997 to 1998, a 56 percent reduction in drug seizures. Is this fully cooperating to stop drugs at their source or as they transit through that country?

Cocaine, a 35 percent reduction in seizures in the period from 1997 to 1998.

And if we want to look at methamphetamine, how it is affecting some of the heartland of America, about 85 percent of the methamphetamines in Minnesota is smuggled from Mexico. And this is the source, the Minneapolis Star Tribune, Sunday September 27th of last year. Again, hard drugs coming in through Mexico; Mexico certified by this administration.

Finally, the DEA administrator, Tom Constantine, again questioned what this administration is doing and talked about Mexico. He said, "The truly significant principals have not been arrested and appear to be immune from any law enforcement effort." So this administration has certified a country as fully cooperating that, again, is dealing in death and destruction at every level of our effort to eradicate illegal narcotics from coming into this country.

Now, what is my role? Again, I chair the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform. Today I join my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), who introduced a resolution to decertify Mexico. I did not sign on that resolution, although I now support that resolution because of the evidence I have found.

However, the Speaker has asked me and other chair members of the majority to conduct a thorough review of the drug policy of the Congress, the drug policy of the Nation and also of the certification and decertification of Mexico and other countries that are dealing in illegal narcotics. I, as chairman, intend to conduct that review to see if drug decertification is the answer, to see what other mechanisms we can enact to hold Mexico's feet to the fire and other nations who deal in illegal narcotics and do not make an effort to fully cooperate and yet receive benefits from the United States Government. So that will be my task and my responsibility to work with others.

We launch that investigation, that review and that oversight process tomorrow. One of the subcommittees of the Committee on International Relations will begin tomorrow looking at the drug policy issue in Latin America. We know, again, that almost all of the heroin coming into the United States, the huge quantities of heroin, comes from Colombia and is also produced in Mexico and transits to the United States. We know that cocaine is produced in Peru and coca in Bolivia, and now a majority of cocaine in Colombia, and that also is transited through Mexico.

So we know where the problem is. What we do not know are the solutions on how to get a handle on it. We do

know that we must restore a few dollars into the programs that are most effective, the most cost effective. Stopping drugs at their source, where they are grown, the crop eradication programs, we have now seen are so effective. And substitution programs in Bolivia and Peru we know are stopping production, they are stopping cultivation and providing alternative development for people in those regions so they do not go back to producing the basis for hard drugs.

We know we have to work with President Pastrana, the new president in Colombia. We must get him the resources to eradicate the hectares of poppy that have grown while the administration stopped equipment and resources from reaching that region. We know we must do that.

We must get a handle on the situation in Mexico. Mexico is losing control of its Nation. The Baja peninsula is now controlled by drug lords. Ironically, where the President met, in Merida, the Yucatan peninsula is now controlled by the drug lords; and other areas, regions and states of Mexico are totally controlled by narco-terrorists who are raining destruction, who have gone from corruption to terrorist intimidation of people in that country.

I will say that there are people at the top, President Zedillo, a brave attorney general who we met with, that are trying their best, but I am concerned that they are about to lose control of their nation to narco-terrorists. So we must find a solution. We must find some way to hold their feet to the fire, to aid them, as good neighbors.

We must reach across the aisle when the minority leader of the House says that what the President has done is not correct relating to Mexico, and we must find a solution that is correct. We cannot afford to let this go on. We cannot fill our jails with any more Americans. We cannot subsidize the quarter of a trillion dollar loss to our economy, not to mention the destroyed lives of our young people and other Americans who could have been so productive.

So that is our task. It is an important task. It is, again, I believe the biggest social problem facing this Nation.

Stop and think if we could eliminate 60 percent of the crime. Stop and think if we could eliminate 60 to 70 percent of those deaths. Stop and think if we could have more productive citizens rather than people strung out on drugs, ruining again their lives and their loved ones' lives, of what we could do in this Nation.

So I believe it is an important task. I do not plan to let up for a minute. I do not have the answers at this point, but we will review every possible solution. We extend our hand of cooperation across the aisle to our colleagues and to anyone who is interested, who wants to come forward and help us with a problem that we must address, that we must resolve in the best interest of the Congress, in the best interest of our Nation, and in the best interest

of those who hope to have any future in this country, our young people.

INTRODUCING H.R. 948, THE DEBT DOWNPAYMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a letter I received today. It is a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Alan Paul of Ellsworth, Kansas. The Pauls write to suggest that Congress use its good sense and to do what is best for the country.

Mr. Paul specifically writes, "Comes now a budget surplus. You know and I know that the 'surplus' can be what we want it to be depending on how we cook the books. Fact is, without Social Security, there is no surplus. Suddenly, Democrats see new programs we cannot get along without, Republicans get those tax cut dollar signs in their eyes, and our collective brains get all mushy. I have a revolutionary idea," Mr. Paul writes. "Let's do nothing. No new programs, no tax cuts, nothing. Let the surplus reduce the debt, thereby reducing the annual interest payments out of the budget and thereby bolstering Social Security."

Mr. Paul is right. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Debt Downpayment Act, legislation that will establish a plan for paying down our national debt. While many in Washington celebrate the idea that we have balanced the books, Americans, and especially Kansans, have not forgotten that our national debt stands at \$5.6 trillion. That is over \$20,000 for every American. Twenty thousand dollars per person is not balanced, and using the Social Security Trust Fund to mask the true extent of the debt is not balanced either.

Debt is certainly not a glamorous issue in Washington. It is much more exciting to talk about new programs that our surpluses could fund. In each of our districts there are great needs. In Kansas, all of our major industries face record low prices. Wheat, oil, hogs and cattle prices are wiping out family farmers, ranchers and small oil producers.

□ 1930

Our hospitals are struggling to meet the needs of an aging and rural population. I rise this evening not to suggest that we should ignore the pressing needs of the American people but to remind Members of Congress that as we meet these needs we must continue to make the difficult choices that can help us reduce our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, despite the claims, we do not have surpluses as far as the eye can see. In fact, we have a very short window of time where demographics and a strong national economy will allow us to pay down a portion of our national debt.

The Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Dr. Greenspan, have all warned us repeatedly that the good times will not last forever. Assuming we continue with our current economic growth, deficits are still expected to return in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the chart shows where we are today in 1998, and we are headed on the right path but, lo and behold, doing nothing still sends us back and in 2040 the projected debt levels are two times our gross national product.

Those are not good signs. This is the window of opportunity for us to do something right, and we cannot afford to let this chance pass us by.

The legislation I have introduced is simple. If Congress does nothing to botch this opportunity, the amount of our publicly-held debt is expected to be reduced by \$2.4 trillion by 2009. This bill simply locks in today's once in a lifetime opportunity to pay down the debt by establishing gradually reduced debt limits each year. Doing so provides an average annual down payment on the debt of \$240 billion each year for the next 10 years and requires no new spending cuts.

I urge all my colleagues to consider the benefits of paying down the debt. Today, nearly 15 percent of the Federal budget goes to make interest payments on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, 15 percent of our budget goes to pay interest on the national debt. That is almost as much as national defense, almost as much as Social Security, and more than income security or Medicare. It is a huge portion of the problem we face each year.

The budget today looks too much like bad credit card spending. We pay only the minimum amount each month. We spend a hefty sum on interest and we never establish a plan to pay down the principal.

My bill would save an estimated \$730 billion in interest payments over the next 10 years. That is good for the Federal budget and it is good for the economy. We can lower interest rates for America's car loans, our mortgages, our student loans and our farm debt and free up 11 percent of the budget for tax cuts or other important priorities.

Foremost, reducing our debt strengthens our ability to meet our obligations for Social Security. In 2013, just 14 years from now, as the baby-boomers retire, payroll taxes are expected to be insufficient to meet the promised Social Security benefits. Congress will either need to raise taxes or tap into general revenue. By reducing the debt, we can do something today that makes it much easier to meet the needs of the next generation's retirement.

This legislation also removes Social Security trust fund revenues from all calculations of the surplus. We must be honest with ourselves and with the American people.

H.R. 948 offers a simple, straightforward plan for paying down our na-

tional debt. With the right decisions today, we can strengthen economic growth into the next generation, but if we fail we could see an expansion of the size and scope of government and a debt burden that lowers the standard of living for every American. I urge each of us to make the necessary commitment and seize this historic opportunity to do the right thing for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Paul's letter concludes, "And maybe, Jerry, just maybe, if you pull off this miraculous feat, God will forgive us all for the terrible sins we have committed against our future generations."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EVANS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of family illness.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of family medical reasons.

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOSELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes each, today and March 3.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYES, for 5 minutes, on March 4.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio for 5 minutes today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 3, 1999, at 10 a.m.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of June 18, 1998 through January 6, 1999, shall be treated as though received on March 2, 1999. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the 105th Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

792. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sugar to be Imported and Re-exported in Refined Form or in Sugar Containing Products, or Used for the Production of Polyhydric Alcohol (RIN: 0551-AA39) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

793. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting A report identifying the percentage of funds that were expended during the preceding fiscal year for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads, pursuant to Public Law 105—85 section 358(e) (111 stat. 1696); to the Committee on Armed Services.

794. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Television-Audio Support Activity [DFARS Case 98-D008] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

795. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Specifications and Standards Requisition [DFARS Case 98-D022] received February 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

796. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement; Flexible Progress Payments [DFARS Case 98-D400] received February 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

797. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; People's Republic of China [DFARS Case 98-D305] received February 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

798. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense

Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Singapore Accession to Government Procurement Agreement [DFARS Case 98-D029] received February 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

799. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS); Individual Case Management [DoD 6010.8-R] (RIN: 0720-AA30) received February 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

800. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule—Credit by Brokers and Dealers; List of Foreign Margin Stocks [Regulation T] received February 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

801. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Student Assistance General Provisions—received February 22, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

802. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Head Start Program (RIN: 0970-AB31) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

803. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Michigan: Correction [MI67-02-7275; FRL-6302-3] received February 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

804. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Wyoming: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-6302-1] received February 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

805. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Emissions: Group I Polymers and Resins and Group IV Polymers and Resins and Standards of Performance for Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions from the Polymer Manufacturing Industry [AD-FRL-6301-6] (RIN: 2060-AH-47) received February 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

806. A letter from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia: Reasonably Available Control Technology for Oxides of Nitrogen [DC017-2013a; FRL-6234-6] received February 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

807. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Standards for Animal Food and Food Additives in Standardized Animal Food; Correction [Docket No. 95N-0313] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

808. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA,

Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Foods and Drugs; Technical Amendments; Correction—received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

809. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplement report about the continuing deployment of U.S. military personnel in Kenya; (H. Doc. No. 106—33); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

810. A letter from the Managing Director for Administration, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Production of nonpublic records and testimony of OPIC employees in legal proceedings (RIN: 3420-AA02) received February 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

811. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting notification that the Congressional Budget Office has waived the deduction-of-pay requirement for a reemployed annuitant, pursuant to Public Law 102—190; to the Committee on Government Reform.

812. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 1999 Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to Public Law 103—62; to the Committee on Government Reform.

813. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a monthly listing of new investigations, audits, and evaluations; to the Committee on Government Reform.

814. A letter from the Office of Inspector General, National Science Foundation, transmitting the semiannual report of the National Science Foundation for September 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

815. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

816. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the performance plan for fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

817. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting notification of a vacancy where an appointment is required for the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

818. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice on leasing systems for the Central Gulf of Mexico, Sale 172, scheduled to be held in March 1999, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(8); to the Committee on Resources.

819. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alaska Regulatory Program [AK-007-FOR, Amendment No. VII] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

820. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Reclamation Program; Enhancing AML Reclamation (RIN: 1029-AB89) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

821. A letter from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmit-

ting an annual report on actions taken in respect to the New England fishing capacity reduction initiative; to the Committee on Resources.

822. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock by Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Mothership Component in the Bering Sea subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands management area [Docket No. 981222313-8320-02; I.D. 020999B] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

823. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Vessels Greater than 99 feet LOA Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea [Docket No. 981222313-8320-02; I.D. 021199A] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

824. A letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington D.C., on September 15, 1998, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

825. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Nonimmigrant Visa Exemption for Certain Nationals of the British Virgin Islands Entering the United States Through St. THOMAS, United States Virgin Islands [INS No. 1956-98] (RIN: 1115-AF28) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

826. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Exceptions to the Educational Requirements for Naturalization for Certain Applicants [INS No. 1702-96] (RIN: 1115-AE02) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

827. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Santa Barbara Channel, CA [COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA; 98-012] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

828. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Chef Menteur Pass, LA [CGD8-96-053] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

829. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Shlofmitz BatMitzvah Fireworks, Hudson River, Manhattan, New York [CGD01-99-001] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

830. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Back Bay of Biloxi, MS [CGD8-96-049] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

831. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Motor Carrier Registration and Insurance (RIN: 2125-AE24) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

832. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-11025; AD 99-04-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

833. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Hunter Army Airfield (AAF) [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-2] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

834. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Regulations Governing Fees For Services Performed In Connection With Licensing and Related Services—1999 Update— received February 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

835. A letter from the Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting a list of donations under the "Computers for Learning" (K-12) program for the period July 1998 through December 31, 1998; to the Committee on Science.

836. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner (Examinations), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Qualifying wages under section 41 in determining the tax credit for increasing research activities—received February 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

837. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner (Examination), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—All Industries Coordinated Issue: Qualifying Wages Under Section 41 in Determining the Tax Credit for Increasing Research Activities, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

838. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner (Examination), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Congressional Review of Market Segment Specialization Program (MSSP) Audit Techniques Guides— received February 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

839. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Election in respect of losses attributable to a disaster [Revenue Ruling 99-13] received February 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

840. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 99-11] received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

841. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Gray Market Imports and Other Traded Goods [T.D. 99-21] (RIN: 1515-AB49) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

842. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting notification of the intent to obligate Fiscal Year 1999 SEED funds by the United States Information Agency; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

843. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting notification of the intent to obligate Fiscal Year 1999 SEED funds by the Department of State; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

844. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare Program; Changes to the MedicareChoice Program [HCFA-1030-F] (RIN: 0938-A129) received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

845. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the schedule for the development of a prospective payment system (PPS) for home health services furnished under the Medicare program; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 661. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels if the European Union adopts certain aircraft noise regulations (Rept. 106-35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 609. A bill to amend the Export Apple and Pear Act to limit the applicability of the Act to apples (Rept. 106-36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 85. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 603) to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation incidents (Rept. 106-37). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 86. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 661) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels if the European Union adopts certain aircraft noise regulations (Rept. 106-38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4. A bill to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense (Rept. 106-39, Pt. 1).

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on International Relations discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4. Referral to the Committee on International Relations extended for a period ending not later than March 2, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 891. A bill to authorize certain States to prohibit the importation of solid waste from other States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 892. A bill to renew education in this country by providing funds for school renovation and construction, scholarships that allow parents choice in education, and tax incentives; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 893. A bill to provide that the National Assessment Governing Board has the exclusive authority over all policies, direction, and guidelines for establishing and implementing certain voluntary national tests; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr.

WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FROST, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HORN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NEY, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. REGULA, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 894. A bill to encourage States to incarcerate individuals convicted of murder, rape, or child molestation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for

herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 895. A bill to restore a United States voluntary contribution to the United Nations Population Fund; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 896. A bill to require the installation and use by schools and libraries of a technology for filtering or blocking material on the Internet on computers with Internet access to be eligible to receive or retain universal service assistance; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 897. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study and issue a report on predatory and discriminatory practices of airlines which restrict consumer access to unbiased air transportation passenger service and fare information; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCINNIS (for himself, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 898. A bill designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the "Spanish Peaks Wilderness"; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 899. A bill to provide for the liquidation of Libyan assets to pay for the costs of travel to and from the Hague of families of the victims of the crash of Pan Am flight 103 for the purpose of attending the trial of the terrorist suspects in the crash; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 900. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to enhance consumer disclosures regarding credit card terms and charges, to restrict issuance of credit cards to students, to expand protections in connection with unsolicited credit cards and third-party checks and to protect consumers from unreasonable practices that result in unnecessary credit costs or loss of credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 901. A bill to amend the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 to provide for the transfer of amounts of the Polish-American Enterprise Fund upon the termination of that Enterprise Fund to a private, nonprofit organization located in Poland; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FORD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 902. A bill to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr.

HAYWORTH, Mr. HORN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SEXTON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 903. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign the \$1 bill so as to incorporate the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, a list describing the Articles of the Constitution, and a list describing the Articles of Amendment, on the reverse side of such currency; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. STARK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KLINK, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 904. A bill to assure access under group health plans and health insurance coverage to covered emergency medical services; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 905. A bill to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WYNN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 906. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons who have been released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 907. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to implement a pilot program to improve access to the national transportation system for small communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 908. A bill to improve consumers' access to airline industry information, to promote competition in the aviation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 909. A bill to provide funding for States to correct Y2K problems in computers that are used to administer State and local government programs; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. HORN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 910. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers and in coordination with other Federal agency heads, to participate in the funding and implementation of a balanced, long-term solution to the problems of groundwater contamination, water supply, and reliability affecting the San Gabriel groundwater basin in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 911. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 310 New Bern Avenue in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the "Terry Sanford Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 912. A bill to provide for the medical use of marijuana; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 913. A bill to provide retrospective application of an amendment made by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 pertaining to the applicability of mandatory minimum penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FROST, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 914. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the penalty for late enrollment under the Medicare Program to 10 percent and twice the period of no enrollment; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 915. A bill to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 916. A bill to make technical amendments to section 10 of title 9, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 917. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States Post Office located at 705 N. Plaza Street in Carson City,

Nevada, as the "Paul Laxalt Federal Building and United States Post Office"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOLDEN:

H.R. 918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase to 100 percent the amount of the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H.R. 919. A bill to adjust the immigration status of certain Liberian nationals who were provided refuge in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H.R. 920. A bill to expand the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and sale of firearms and ammunition, and to expand the jurisdiction of the Secretary to include firearm products and non-powder firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 921. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide emergency market loss assistance to swine producers for losses incurred due to economic and market conditions in the United States beyond their control that occurred during a three-month period in 1998, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 922. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum amount allowable as an annual contribution to education individual retirement accounts from \$500 to \$2,000, phased in over 3 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FROST, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 923. A bill to authorize the establishment of the National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow vendor refunds of Federal excise taxes on undyed kerosene used in unvented heaters for home heating purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GREEN of

Texas, Mr. COOK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. DELAURIO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 925. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for qualified individuals for bone mass measurement (bone density testing) to prevent fractures associated with osteoporosis and to help women make informed choices about their reproductive and post-menopausal health care; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 926. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to issue an environmental impact statement before the International Joint Commission implements any water regulation plan affecting the water levels of Lake Ontario or the St. Lawrence River; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINNIS (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. SHOWS):

H.R. 927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the annual exclusion from the gift tax to \$20,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 928. A bill to require that the 2000 decennial census include either a general or targeted followup mailing of census questionnaires, whichever, in the judgement of the Secretary of Commerce, will be more effective in securing the return of census information from the greatest number of households possible; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 929. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require that the questionnaire used in taking the 2000 decennial census be made available in certain languages besides English; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 930. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to remove the requirement that exposure resulting in stomach cancer occur before age 30, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that an individ-

ual who leaves employment because of sexual harassment or the loss of child care will, for purposes of determining such individual's eligibility for unemployment compensation, be treated as having left such employment for good cause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat a portion of welfare benefits which are contingent on employment as earned income for purposes of the earned income credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mrs.

JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FORD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FOLEY, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 933. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that coverage of bone mass measurements is provided under the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 934. A bill to prohibit the commercial harvesting of Atlantic striped bass in the coastal waters and the exclusive economic zone; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for tuition and related expenses for public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts contributed to charitable organizations which provide elementary or secondary school scholarships and for contributions of, and for, instructional materials and materials for extra-curricular activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms.

JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. CARSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SABO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. BROWN of Florida,

Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ETHERIDGE):

H.R. 938. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FORD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DIXON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 939. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to eliminate certain mandatory minimum penalties relating to crack cocaine offenses; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHERWOOD:

H.R. 940. A bill to establish the Lackawanna Heritage Valley American Heritage Area; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. HORN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FROST, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 941. A bill to establish a congressional commemorative medal for organ donors and their families; referred to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 942. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reduce restrictions on media ownership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SABO, Mr. FORD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 943. A bill to reimburse an individual who is the subject of an independent counsel's investigation and is indicted but found not guilty for attorneys' fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 944. A bill to convert a temporary Federal judgeship in the district of Hawaii to

a permanent judgeship, to authorize an additional permanent judgeship in the district of Hawaii, extend statutory authority for magistrate positions in Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 945. A bill to deny to aliens the opportunity to apply for asylum in Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 946. A bill to restore Federal recognition to the Indians of the Graton Rancheria of California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 947. A bill to address resource management issues in Glacier Bay National Park, Alaska; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 948. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, to establish lower statutory limits for debt held by the public for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2009, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution disapproving the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution urging the President to oppose expansion of the Oil-for-Food Program in Iraq, condemning Saddam Hussein for the actions the Government of Iraq has taken against the Iraqi people and for its defiance of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Res. 84. A resolution recognizing the positive steps and achievements of the Republic of India and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to foster peaceful relations between the two nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 87. A resolution electing members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 88. A resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H. Res. 89. A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal investment in biomedical research should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 90. A resolution recognizing the "Code Adam" child safety program, commending retail business establishments that have implemented programs to protect children from abduction, and urging retail business establishments that have not implemented such programs to consider doing so; to the Committee on Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. GREENWOOD introduced A bill (H.R. 949) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel PRIDE OF MANY; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 13: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 17: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 19: Mr. WAMP, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 22: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 36: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 38: Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 49: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 53: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 61: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 89: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. REYES, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 110: Mr. HOYER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 111: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WELLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FORD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GOODE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 116: Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 119: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HAYES, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MICA, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FORD, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 125: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 150: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. SCHAFER.

H.R. 165: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STARK, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 206: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 218: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 219: Mr. SALMON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 220: Mr. SCHAFER.

H.R. 232: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 235: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 271: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MOORE, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 318: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 323: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 351: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 357: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 363: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 364: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 365: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 366: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 371: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. HORN.
H.R. 372: Mr. BORSKI.
H.R. 382: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 393: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 394: Mr. PALLONE and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 395: Mr. PALLONE and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 397: Mr. PALLONE and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 405: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 406: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 412: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 415: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 417: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 423: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 424: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 443: Mr. OLVER, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 449: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 455: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 457: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 472: Mr. SHAW and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 483: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 488: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 489: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 502: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 506: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WAMP, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 515: Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 516: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 517: Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 518: Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 530: Mr. RILEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 532: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SABO, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 537: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 540: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WYNN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TOWNS,

Mr. MICA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 541: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 548: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 573: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WISE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 576: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 595: Mr. FORD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 608: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 609: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 617: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. STARK, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 621: Mr. KASICH and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 623: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 628: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 647: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 654: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 656: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 664: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 670: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 682: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 691: Mr. FILNER, Mr. NEY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 696: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 701: Mr. LINDER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 707: Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 708: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H.R. 718: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 735: Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 750: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BONILLA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 756: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 763: Mr. HILL of Montana and Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 773: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. WISE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 780: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 788: Mr. KASICH.
H.R. 798: Mr. CLAY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr.

HOEFFEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 800: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 804: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 808: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RILEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. HILL of Montana.
H.R. 833: Mr. COOK, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 852: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. COOKSEY.
H.R. 872: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 877: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 882: Mr. TANNER, Mr. EWING, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. MICA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. LEACH, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. FOLEY.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. LUTHER.
H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. HOYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. METCALF, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TERRY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SHADEGG.
H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. STUPAK.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DELAURO.
H. Res. 32: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H. Res. 41: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H. Res. 79: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.